MANUAL OF THE HISTORY OF DOGMAS

OTTEN

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

A MANUAL OF THE HISTORY OF DOGMAS

VOLUME I

THE DEVELOPMENT OF DOGMAS DURING THE PATRISTIC AGE, 100--869

BY

REV. BERNARD J. OTTEN, S. J.

PROFESSOR OF DOGMATIC THEOLOGY AND THE HISTORY OF DOGMAS
IN
ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY

THIRD EDITION

B. HERDER
17 SOUTH BROADWAY, ST. LOUIS, MO.
AND
68 GREAT RUSSELL ST., LONDON, W. C.
1922

Property of
COSA
Please return to
Graduate Theological
Union Library

IMPRIMI POTEST

Alexander J. Burrowes, S.J.
Praep. Prov. Missour.

Sti. Ludovici, die 6 Jan. 1917.

NIHIL OBSTAT

Sti. Ludovici, die 18 Maii, 1917.
F. G. Holweck,
Censor Librorum

IMPRIMATUR

Sti. Ludovici, die 18 Maii, 1917.
✠*Joannes J. Glennon,*
Archiepiscopus
Sti. Ludovici

Copyright, 1917
by
Joseph Gummersbach

All rights reserved

Printed in U. S. A.

FOREWORD

The purpose of the present book is indicated by its title — *A Manual of the History of Dogmas.* The work strives to present as briefly as the subject matter permits what is usually dwelt upon at length by the Professor of the History of Dogmas in his class-lectures. It is intended primarily for ecclesiastical students, who follow a course of lectures on this important subject; but it is expected to provide useful reading for those others also, and they surely are many, who are interested in the matter of Doctrinal Development. In the author's opinion the crying need there is of a compendious History of Dogmas amply justifies the book's publication. No *Manual* of this kind has as yet appeared in English. It is true, the first three volumes of Tixeront's excellent work in French have been issued in an English translation, but that work is too voluminous to serve as a handbook. Hence the need of a compendious History of Dogmas still remains, and to supply this need the author offers the present *Manual.*

Feast of the Holy Name, 1917.

b3b

FOREWORD TO THE SECOND EDITION

The reviews of this Manual have been so uniformly favorable, and so very few improvements have been suggested, that the author considers himself justified in issuing this second edition merely as a reprint of the first, correcting, however, such typographical errors as a careful reading enabled him to detect. The three or four improvements that were kindly suggested called for a fuller development of some particular topics, such as "Penance in the Early Church," "the Origin of the Hierarchy," and "the Primacy of Rome." The suggestions have been carefully considered, and the author intends to act on them in a future edition, when a few other points also will be further developed.

Feast of the Assumption, 1920.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

FOREWORD iii

BIBLIOGRAPHY xi

INTRODUCTION

DOGMA AND THE HISTORY OF DOGMAS 1

CHAPTER I

SOCIAL AND RELIGIOUS CONDITION OF THE GENTILE WORLD AT THE TIME OF THE FIRST PREACHING OF THE GOSPEL . . 5

A — Social Conditions 6

B — The State of Religion 7

CHAPTER II

ISRAEL AND ITS RELATION TO CHRISTIANITY 18

A — The Palestinian Jews: Their Messianic Hopes . . . 19

B — The Jews of the Dispersion: Their Religious and Philosophical Views 30

CHAPTER III

NEW TESTAMENT TEACHING ON THE FUNDAMENTAL TRUTHS OF CHRISTIANITY 35

A — Christ's Teaching on the Kingdom of Heaven 35

B — The Life Eternal 39

C — St. Paul's Doctrine on the Church of Christ 41

D — The Blessed Trinity and the Person of Christ 44

CHAPTER IV

CHRISTIAN LIFE IN APOSTOLIC TIMES: FIRST APPEARANCE OF HERESIES 51

CHAPTER V

PAGE

THE WRITINGS AND TEACHING OF THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS . . 62
A — The Writings of the Apostolic Fathers 62
B — Teaching of the Apostolic Fathers 69

CHAPTER VI

HERETICAL TENDENCIES AND PAGAN OPPOSITION TO CHRISTIANITY DURING THE SECOND CENTURY 99
A — Gnosticism: Various Systems: Influence on Christian Thought 101
B — Millennarianism 105
C — Pagan Opposition 107

CHAPTER VII

SECOND-CENTURY APOLOGISTS AND THEIR LITERARY ACTIVITIES 110
A — Defense of Christian Morals: Christianity and Philosophy 113
B — Exposition of Christian Doctrine 115

CHAPTER VIII

THE TEACHING OF ST. IRENÆUS AND ST. HIPPOLYTUS 138

CHAPTER IX

MONARCHIAN ABERRATIONS AND MONTANISTIC EXCESSES . . . 153
A — Adoptionism and Modalism 153
B — Montanistic Excesses 156

CHAPTER X

SOME WESTERN THEOLOGIANS AND THE BEGINNINGS OF LATIN THEOLOGY 159
A — Tertullian: His Trinitarian and Christological Teaching 160
B — Novatian: His Treatise on the Trinity 169
C — St. Cyprian: His Teaching on the Church 171

CHAPTER XI

THE BAPTISMAL CONTROVERSY: PENANCE IN THE EARLY CHURCH 180
A — The Baptismal Controversy 180
B — Penance in the Early Church 183

CHAPTER XII

PAGE

First Attempts at Systematic Theology in the East . . . 190
A — Clement of Alexandria 190
B — Origen: Alexandria and Cæsarea 197

CHAPTER XIII

From the Death of Origen to the Council of Nicæa . . . 210

CHAPTER XIV

Rise of the Arian Heresy and the Council of Nicæa . . . 218
A — Rise of the Arian Heresy 219
B — The Council of Nicæa 223
C — Some Fourth Century Theologians 228

CHAPTER XV

The Reaction After Nicæa: Its Causes: An Outline of the Arian Controversy 236
A — The Reaction After Nicæa 236
B — Nature and Causes of the Arian Controversy 237
C — An Outline of the Arian Controversy 240

CHAPTER XVI

The Macedonian and Apollinarian Heresies: The Second General Council 247

CHAPTER XVII

The Essence and Attributes of God: The Blessed Trinity 254
A — The Essence and Attributes of God 254
B — The Blessed Trinity 260

CHAPTER XVIII

Manichæism and Priscillianism: The Problem of Evil: The Work of Creation 276
A — Manichæism and Priscillianism 276
B — The Problem of Evil 282
C — The Work of Creation 284

CHAPTER XIX

PAGE

ANGELOLOGY: ANTHROPOLOGY 293
A — Angelology 293
B — Anthropology 299

CHAPTER XX

THE WORD INCARNATE: THE REDEMPTION OF THE WORLD . . 308
A — The Word Incarnate 308
B — The Redemption of the World 316

CHAPTER XXI

THE DONATIST HERESY: ECCLESIOLOGY 323

CHAPTER XXII

SACRAMENTAL THEOLOGY 338

CHAPTER XXIII

PELAGIANISM AND THE QUESTION OF ORIGINAL SIN 357

CHAPTER XXIV

THE QUESTION OF GRACE: SEMI-PELAGIANISM 368
A — The Question of Grace 369
B — Semi-Pelagianism 379

CHAPTER XXV

THE NESTORIAN HERESY: THE COUNCIL OF EPHESUS . . . 387
A — The Nestorian Heresy 387
B — The Council of Ephesus 396

CHAPTER XXVI

THE MONOPHYSITE HERESY: THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON . . 401
A — The Monophysite Heresy 401
B — The Council of Chalcedon 404

CHAPTER XXVII

SOME NEW DISSENSIONS: THE THREE CHAPTERS: THE FIFTH GENERAL COUNCIL 412
A — Some New Dissensions 412
B — The Three Chapters 415
C — The Fifth General Council 417

CHAPTER XXVIII

PAGE

THE MONOTHELITE CONTROVERSY: THE SIXTH GENERAL COUNCIL 422
A — The Monothelite Controversy 423
B — The Sixth General Council 428

CHAPTER XXIX

CONTEMPORARY CHRISTOLOGY: ORTHODOX MARIOLOGY . . . 433
A — Contemporary Christology 433
B — Orthodox Mariology 441

CHAPTER XXX

THE VENERATION OF THE SAINTS: THE DOCTRINE OF PURGATORY: ESCHATOLOGICAL VIEWS 449
A — The Veneration of the Saints 449
B — The Doctrine of Purgatory 452
C — Eschatological Views 457

CHAPTER XXXI

SOME SUPPLEMENTARY REMARKS ON SUBJECTS DEALT WITH IN THE PRECEDING CHAPTERS 464

CHAPTER XXXII

THE IMAGE CONTROVERSY: THE SEVENTH GENERAL COUNCIL 476
A — Historical Aspect of the Question 477
B — The Iconoclast Heresy 481
C — The Seventh General Council 486

CHAPTER XXXIII

THE FILIOQUE CONTROVERSY: SPANISH ADOPTIONISM: THE EIGHTH GENERAL COUNCIL 489
A — The Filioque Controversy 490
B — Spanish Adoptionism 498
C — The Eighth General Council 501
Conclusion 504
Index 509

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following is a partial list of books consulted in the composition of this Manual. Those marked * are by non-Catholic authors. Works especially adapted for supplementary reading are referred to in a footnote at the beginning of each chapter.

Alzog, J., Grundriss der Patrologie. Vierte Auflage. Herder, Freiburg, 1888.

Atzberger, L., Die Christliche Eschatologie in den Stadien ihrer Offenbarung. Herder, Freiburg, 1890.

——Geschichte der Christlichen Eschatologie innerhalb der vornicaenischen Zeit. Herder, Freiburg, 1896.

——Die Logoslehre des hl. Athanasius. Muenchen, 1880.

Bardenhewer, O., Patrology. Translated from the Second German Edition by Thomas Shahan, D.D. Herder, St. Louis, 1908.

——Geschichte der Altkirchlichen Litteratur, 3 vols. Herder, Freiburg, 1902–12.

Batiffol, P., Primitive Catholicism. Translated from the Fifth French Edition by H. L. Brianceau. Longmans, New York, 1911.

——Études d'Histoire et de Théologie Positive. Cinquième Edition, J. Gabalda & Cie, Paris, 1907.

* Benson, White, E., Cyprian: His Life, His Times, His Work. D. Appleton, New York, 1897.

* Bethune-Baker, J. F., An Introduction to the Early History of Christian Doctrine. Methuen & Co., London, 1903.

Cumont, F., The Mysteries of Mithra. Translated from the Second Revised French Edition by Thomas J. McCormack. Keagan Paul, London, 1903.

D'Alés, A., La Théologie de Saint Hippolyte. Beauchesne & Cie, Paris, 1906.

——La Théologie de Tertullien. Beauchesne & Cie, Paris, 1905.

——L'Édit de Calliste: Étude sur les Origines de la Pénitence Chrétienne. Beauchesne & Cie. Paris, 1915.

Doellinger, J. I., Hippolytus and Callistus, or the Church of Rome in the first half of the Third Century. Edinburgh, 1876.

——Jew and Gentile in the Courts of the Temple of Christ, 2 vols. 1862 foll.

* Dorner, A., Grundriss der Dogmengeschichte, Reimer, Berlin, 1899.

Duchesne, L., Early History of the Christian Church. Translated from the Fourth French Edition, 2 vols. Longmans, New York, 1911–12.

——Christian Worship: Its Origin and Evolution. A Study of the Latin Liturgy up to the Time of Charlemagne. Translated from the Third French Edition by M. L. McClure. Second English Edition, London, 1904.
Dufourcq, A., Saint Irénée. Deuxième Edition. Lecoffre, Paris, 1904.
* Farrar, F., Lives of the Fathers, 2 vols. MacMillan, New York, 1889.
Feder, A. L., Justins des Maertyrers Lehre von Jesus Christus. Eine Dogmengeschichtliche Monographie. Herder, Freiburg, 1906.
Felten, J., Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte, oder Judentum und Heidentum zur Zeit Christi und der Apostel, 2 vols. Manz, Regensburg, 1910.
Fortescue, A., The Orthodox Eastern Church. Second Edition. Catholic Truth Society, London, 1908.
Funk, F. X., Patres Apostolici, 2 vols. Tuebingen, 1901.
——Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum. Paderborn, 1905.
——Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen, 3 vols. Paderborn, 1897 foll.
* Gwatkin, H. M., Studies of Arianism, chiefly referring to the character and chronology of the reaction which followed the Council of Nicæa. Second Edition. Cambridge, 1900.
* Harnack, A., Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte, 3 vols. Vierte neu durchgearbeitete und vermehrte Auflage. Tuebingen, 1909.
——Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten, 2 vols. Zweite Auflage. Leipzig, 1906.
Hefele, C. J., A History of the Councils of the Church, 7 vols. Second German Edition, 1879 foll. Only the first three volumes have been translated into English. Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark.
Hergenroether, J., Handbuch der allgemeinen Kirchengeschichte, 3 vols. Vierte Auflage, neu bearbeitet von Dr. J. P. Kirsch. Herder, Freiburg, 1902.
——Photius, Patriarch von Konstantinopel. Sein Leben, seine Schriften und das Griechische Schisma, 3 vols. 1867–69.
Kellner, K. A. H., Heortology: A History of Christian Festivals. Herder, St. Louis, 1908.
Kern, J., Tractatus de Extrema Unctione. Pustet, Ratisbon, 1907.
Klee, H., Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte, 2 vols. Mainz, 1837 foll.
Kirsch, J. P., Die Lehre von der Gemeinschaft der Heiligen im Christlichen Alterthum. Kirchheim, Mainz, 1900.
Krebs, E., Der Logos als Heiland im ersten Jahrhundert. Herder, Freiburg, 1910.
Lebreton, J. Les Origines du Dogme de la Trinité. Beauchesne & Cie, Paris, 1910.
Lepin, M., Christ and the Gospel or Jesus the Messiah and Son of God. Authorized English Version. McVey, Philadelphia, 1910.
* Lightfoot, J. B., Dissertations on the Apostolic Age. London, 1892.
——The Apostolic Fathers, 4 vols. London, 1885–90.

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

* Loofs, F., Leitfaden zum Studium der Dogmengeschichte. Dritte Auflage. Halle, 1892.
Maguire, E., Is Schism Lawful? A Study in Primitive Ecclesiology with Special Reference to the Question of Schism. Gill & Son, Dublin, 1915.
Mansi, Joan. Dom., Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio, 63 vols. Paris, 1903 foll.
Migne, J. F., Patrologiæ Cursus Completus. Series Græca, 161 vols. Series Latina, 221 vols. Paris, 1854 foll.
Newman, J. H., An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine. Eleventh Edition. Longmans, New York, 1900.
——The Arians of the Fourth Century. New Edition. London, 1901.
O'Donnell, M. J., Penance in the Early Church. Gill & Son, Dublin, 1908.
O'Dwyer, M., Confirmation. A Study of the Development of Sacramental Theology. Benziger, New York, 1915.
* Otto, J. K. T., Corpus Apologetarum Christianorum Sæculi Secundi, 9 vols. Third Edition. Jena, 1876 foll.
Petavius, Dionys., De Theologicis Dogmatibus, 4 vols. Paris, 1644 foll.
Pourrat, P., Theology of the Sacraments. A Study in Positive Theology. Authorized Translation from the Third French Edition. Herder, St. Louis, 1910.
Prat, F., La Théologie de Saint Paul, 2 vols. Deuxième Edition. Beauchesne & Cie, Paris, 1908–10.
Probst, F., Liturgie der drei ersten Jahrhunderte. Tuebingen, 1870.
——Liturgie des 4 Jahrhunderts und deren Reform. Muenster, 1893.
* Ramsay, W. M., The Church in the Roman Empire before 170. London, 1893.
Rauschen, G., Eucharist and Penance in the First Six Centuries of the Church. Authorized Translation from the Second German Edition. Herder, St. Louis, 1913.
——Grundriss der Patrologie, mit besonderer Beruecksichtigung der Dogmengeschichte. Herder, Freiburg, 1906.
* Realencyklopædie fuer Protestantische Theologie und Kirche, 22 vols. Herzog-Hauck, Leipzig, 1896–1909.
Renaudot, E., Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio, 2 vols. Paris, 1715–16.
Riviere, J., The Doctrine of the Atonement, 2 vols. Authorized Translation by Luigi Cappadelta. Herder, St. Louis, 1909.
Schwane, J., Histoire des Dogmes, 6 vols. French Translation from the Second German Edition by A. Degert and P. Belet. Beauchesne & Cie, Paris, 1903–4.
Struckmann, A., Die Gegenwart Christi in der hl. Eucharistie nach den schriftlichen Quellen der vornicænischen Zeit. Wien, 1905.
* Swainson, C. A., The Greek Liturgies, chiefly from original authorities. Cambridge, 1884.

Thurston, H., The Memory of our Dead. Herder, St. Louis, 1916.
Tixeront, J., History of Dogmas, 3 vols. Patristic Period. Translated from the Fifth French Edition by H. L. B. Herder, St. Louis, 1910–16.
Toner, P. J., Dissertatio Historico-Theologica de Lapsu et Peccato Originali. Browne & Nolan, Dublin, 1904.
Truth Society, Catholic, Lectures on the History of Religions, 5 vols. Herder, St. Louis, 1910–11.
Turmel, J., Histoire de la Théologie Positive, 2 vols. Beauchesne & Cie, 1904–6.
Wilpert, J., Die Malereien in den Katakomben Roms. Freiburg, 1903.

A MANUAL OF THE HISTORY OF DOGMAS

INTRODUCTION

Dogma and the History of Dogmas

The word *dogma,* like many other religious and philosophical terms adopted from ancient usage, received a new meaning as employed by Christian writers. In the philosophical language of Greece it was commonly used to signify tenets or doctrines resting on a solid basis, whether of authority or reason, and as such claiming the assent of a prudent mind. In this sense Plutarch speaks of "the dogmas concerning the soul" [1] and Aristotle refers to the "unwritten dogmas of Plato." [2] Latin writers on philosophy attached a similar meaning to the term. Thus, for instance, Cicero says that the decrees of wisdom "are called *dogmata* by philosophers, and none of them can be set aside without making one guilty of a crime." [3]

This was, however, a derived meaning. Primarily the term denoted anything that seemed good or reasonable; hence an opinion, a resolution, a precept, or ordinance. In this sense it occurs several times in Holy Scripture, especially in the New Testament. Thus the edict of Cæsar Augustus, that the whole world should be enrolled, is called a *dogma;* [4] a body of such edicts is referred to as *dogmata;* [5] ordinances of the Mosaic Law are designated by the same term,[6] as are also the authoritative decisions of the Council of Jerusalem in reference to the observances enjoined by the Law of Christ.[7]

Early Christian writers use the term in both senses, and sometimes in one and the same connection. Ignatius of Antioch, for instance, speaks of the "*dogmata* of the Lord and

[1] Mor. 14, 3.
[2] Phys. Ausc. 4, 2.
[3] Acad. 2, 9.
[4] Luke, 2, 1.
[5] Acts, 16, 4.
[6] Ephes. 2, 15.
[7] Acts, 16, 4; 15, 20.

the Apostles,"[8] understanding thereby their teaching and precepts. The Greek Apologists of the second century frequently refer to the "Christian *dogmata*" as a philosophy of life, regarding them as a guide both in respect of faith and moral conduct. Little by little, however, we find the term restricted to matters of faith as contrasted with precepts. Thus Cyril of Jerusalem, who wrote in the fourth century, says: "The way of godliness is composed of two things, pious doctrines (*dogmata*) and good actions."[9]

This latter has become the exclusive meaning of Christian dogma. Still, even as used at present, the term has both a wider and a stricter sense. In its wider sense it is applied to any doctrine which in the eyes of the Church is essential to the true interpretation of the faith. In its more restricted meaning it denotes a revealed truth which has in some way been defined by an infallible teaching authority, and as such is proposed to the acceptance of the faithful. It is only in this latter sense that the term is used in the History of Dogmas.

Hence Christian Dogma is obviously less inclusive than Christian Doctrine; for this latter comprises not only defined truths, but also such others as are ordinarily set forth in the instruction of the faithful with the simple approval of the *magisterium ecclesiasticum*. Obviously, too, Christian Dogma presupposes two things: the fact of revelation and the existence of an infallible teaching authority.

The History of Dogmas is a part of Ecclesiastical History, and as such it forms a record of the development of the Church's teaching, taking due account of the causes of that development, both internal and external, and presenting the final results of this critical inquiry in an orderly manner. It presupposes that revealed truths are objectively permanent and immutable, and also that their subjective apprehension and outward expression admits of progress. Hence whilst the meaning of doctrines once revealed never changes, these doctrines may nevertheless in course of time come to be understood more fully, be presented more clearly, and receive a cer-

[8] Ad. Magn. 13. [9] Catech. 4, 2.

tain emphasis from their due coördination with other truths. In this sense every revealed truth is a living germ, the growth and unfolding of which is traced up and recorded in the History of Dogmas.

The determining cause of this growth is twofold. First, the God-given vitality of the Church, which assimilates ever more fully the contents of revealed truths as time passes on. Secondly, the rise of heresies, which calls for a clearer statement of the truths contained in the *depositum fidei.* Both contribute to the development of dogmas, but each in its own way.

How vast this development has been, and, by inference, will continue to be, one begins to realize only on comparing the definitions of later councils, as, for instance, that of Trent, with corresponding statements of the same revealed truths as contained in the Patristic writings of the first centuries of the Church. Equivalence of thought there may be, and identity of objective reality, of course, there is; but in all else the two seem worlds apart. These early Fathers believed all that we believe, for they had the complete *depositum fidei;* but much of what they believed was only implicitly contained in the faith as then explicitly taught by the Church. It required ages of thought and struggle before the mustard seed of the Gospel could grow into a fully developed tree, whose branches extend ever farther and farther over the vast region of revealed truth.

To trace up these various lines of thought, to follow in retrospect these mental struggles towards a fuller and clearer light, properly constitutes the object of the History of Dogmas. It implies, therefore, an unbiased and critical investigation of facts, an historical sifting of evidence, in reference to the development of those religious truths which the Church has authoritatively declared to have been revealed by God. It calls for an accurate and truthful determination of the " course followed by Christian thought in that evolution which thus brought it from the primitive elements of its doctrine to the development of its theology. What were the stages in that

progress? What impulses, what suspensions, what hesitations did it undergo? What circumstances threatened to bring about its deviation from that path, and, as a matter of fact, in certain parts of the Christian community, what deviations did occur? By what men and how was this progress accomplished, and what were the ruling ideas, the dominant principles, which determined its course? These questions the History of Dogmas must answer." [10]

From this it is sufficiently clear that the Sources of the History of Dogmas must include all the records of both the internal and external life of the Church — the works of the Fathers and of ecclesiastical writers, the writings of heretics, the various symbols of the faith, liturgical works and Christian art, constitutions, decrees, and decisions of Popes and Congregations, declarations and definitions of councils, both general and particular, and whatever else may bear witness to the gradual unfolding and final maturing of any given dogma, beginning with the first heart-throb of the Infant Church, after the Pentecostal showers had descended upon the Apostles, and leading up to that fullness of life which she may have attained at the moment when the history of dogmatic development is set down by the writer.

Strictly speaking, the records of revelation itself do not fall within the scope of the History of Dogmas, although a general outline of the revealed truths contained therein is almost indispensable for a full understanding of later developments. To prove that the contents of Holy Scripture are truly the word of God, and to show what progress there was in the manifestation of that word, are matters which the historian of dogmatic development must leave to writers who deal explicitly with the history of divine revelation. The most he can do is to group together the obvious teaching of the Sacred Writings, and then show how this original deposit entered into Christian consciousness in later ages. He simply accepts the seed and records its growth.

[10] Tixeront, Hist. Dogm. I, 2.

CHAPTER I

THE SOCIAL AND RELIGIOUS CONDITION OF THE GENTILE WORLD AT THE TIME OF THE FIRST PREACHING OF THE GOSPEL[1]

As the reception and assimilation of truth, even in the supernatural order, is to some extent conditioned by the religious and moral disposition of the persons to whom it is proposed, it is first of all necessary to cast a glance at the state of the world in which Christianity made its appearance. What was the social condition of the various peoples to whom the Gospel was preached? What were their religious views, their moral tendencies, their philosophical interpretation of things? In one word, what was the nature of the soil in which the seed of revealed truth was first planted?

During the earlier centuries of the Christian era, the preaching of the Gospel was practically confined to the different countries that made up the Roman Empire. Territorially this was of vast extent, forming an immense ellipse, whose major axis extended from the north of England to the river Euphrates, whilst its minor axis reached from Lower Austria to the Sahara Desert. Its population was necessarily of an extremely heterogeneous character, comprising as it did a great variety of nations and tribes. Latins, Greeks, Egyptians, Syrians, Phœnicians, Jews, Celts, Teutons, and Iberians were

[1] On the contents of this chapter much valuable information may be found in Dr. Doellinger's work, "Jew and Gentile in the Courts of the Temple of Christ." The question of Ancient Religions is well treated in the series edited by Martindale, under the title, "Lectures on the History of Religions." Vols. I & II.

all brought together into one great commonwealth, of which Rome was the mistress. Although each conquered nation continued to dwell in its own definite territory, still there was considerable intermingling of races, especially by way of colonization and commerce. Thus Roman colonists established themselves among the Celts in Gaul and Britain, among the Iberians in Spain, among the Greeks in the Grecian Archipelago and in Asia Minor; whilst Jewish and Phœnician merchants settled down wherever there was hope of gain. Greek philosophers and rhetoricians, Oriental mystics, and charlatans from all over the Empire crowded the streets of Rome. It was a vast and varied throng to which the Gospel of Christ was about to be announced; numbering in all, it is estimated, over a hundred million human beings.

A — Social Conditions

Rome was intent not only upon extending the boundaries of the State, but also on building up an empire in which the various discordant elements should be reduced to some sort of homogeneity. Hence, so far as was consistent with the Romans' sense of superiority, an effort was made to break down national barriers and to cause the conquered peoples to regard themselves as integral parts of a great world-empire. For this purpose the most distant provinces were closely bound to the Capital City by means of excellent military roads, by an efficient postal service, and the publication of *Acta,* wherein were recounted the current social happenings, court proceedings, and literary news. To conciliate the provincials still further, national customs, religious worship and local administration of justice were usually not interfered with, although there was constantly a silent influence at work to make Roman views and Roman ways gain the ascendancy. The result of this was, not indeed national unity, but some sort of peaceful association, wherein conquerors and conquered admitted that they were made of the same clay.

Yet whilst there was thus brought about some kind of *rapprochement* between nation and nation, nothing of the sort was ever attempted between the free and the bond, between the rich

and the poor. In this respect Roman society was always divided against itself, and therein lay its weakness. Of the one hundred million inhabitants of the Empire at least a third were slaves. In some cities the proportion was even much higher. Rome itself at the time of Augustus counted over six hundred thousand in a population of a million and a half. Every wealthy citizen had his scores or hundreds or even thousands of slaves, employed partly in his city residence and partly on his rural estates. How miserable was the lot of these unfortunates, history tells only too plainly. In principle they were rated below beasts of burden, and in practice they frequently received worse treatment. They were the master's absolute property, mere chattels, which he might use or abuse as he pleased. They had no legal personality, and consequently could find no redress.

Very numerous, too, were the absolutely poor, who had no means of gaining a livelihood save only by begging or by accepting largesses bestowed either by the State or by private patrons. This latter abuse assumed in course of time frightful dimensions. Thus it is said of Augustus that he had to provide daily rations of corn and money for over two hundred thousand citizens, whilst thousands of stranded foreigners depended entirely on the crumbs that fell from the rich man's table. Charitable institutions there were none, nor was there charity. As Polybius puts it: "A Roman never gives any one anything ungrudgingly." The poor were commonly regarded as accursed of the gods. In Greece poverty was equally widespread, but there, owing to a democratic form of government, the poor forced the rich to maintain them at the public expense.

B — The State of Religion

At the beginning of the Christian era, the prevalent religion of the Empire was largely a sort of syncretism, resulting from a combination of the religious views and practices of the chief components of the population. Of these the ancient Roman, the Greek, Egyptian, and Syrian played the principal parts. The Celtic and German religious views remained almost en-

tirely confined to the peoples of these nationalities. Hence it is only of the former that anything need be said in this connection.

1°. *Roman Religious Views: Roman Gods: Roman Philosophy and its Influence on Religion.*— It has been said that the religion of Rome was based on only two ideas — the might of the gods who were friendly to the State and the power of religious ceremonies over the gods. Hence in practice religion did not consist in the exercise of virtue as enjoined by the gods, but in the faithful and exact performance of religious rites. The old Romans were indeed renowned for their *virtus,* but this term, including in its significance "self-mastery, an unbending firmness of will, with patience, and an iron tenacity of purpose in carrying through whatever was once acknowledged to be right," had primarily an ethical bearing; in the minds of the people it was to all intents and purposes unconnected with religion. It was the ceremonial rites that constituted religion properly so called. These rites consisted of sacrifice and divinations, which were performed by an hierarchical priesthood, with the Pontifex Maximus at its head. The priesthood was largely hereditary, and up to the fourth century before Christ open only to persons of patrician rank. In the beginning human sacrifices seem to have been offered, but within the strictly historical period there is evidence only of the sacrifice of animals and the produce of the earth.

As long as the Roman religion remained uninfluenced by the speculations of philosophy, and that was almost up to the foundation of the Empire, it was essentially polytheistic. Still, beyond even the mightiest gods there existed in the popular mind the *omnipotens fortuna* and the *ineluctabile fatum,* which may perhaps be taken as a faint echo of a primitive monotheistic belief. The principal indigenous gods were Janus and Jana, Saturn, Jupiter Optimus Maximus, Juno, Vesta, Mars, and Ops. These were general nature-powers, or mere abstractions of the human state, and, until Greek influence was brought to bear upon the popular view concerning them, they advanced to no real personality.

Although the ancient Romans were an intensely practical people, without myths and without a literature, yet even during the first five hundred years of the city's existence, gods and *genii* multiplied exceedingly, so that nearly every human occupation and every circumstance of life had some superior being as its guardian and protector. This was a logical outcome of the deification of nature. It is usually admitted, though some writers take a different view of the matter, that the gods were conceived to have an influence only on the physical and not on the moral life of their worshipers. Hence Cicero makes his Academician say: "Herein, indeed, are all agreed, that they have received external advantages — vineyards, corn-fields, olive-gardens, blessings on fruit of tree and field, and, in fine, all the comforts and conveniences of life — at the hands of the gods; but no one has ever acknowledged virtue as a gift of the deity and returned thanks for it as such." [2]

This relation of the gods to their worshipers was changed very much for the worse when, with the conquest of Greece and Oriental countries, the sensual Greek and the bestial Eastern rites found an entrance into Rome. Then the gods, instead of being merely unconnected with the practice of virtue among men, became examples of lustful indulgence and inciters of criminal deeds. There was no excess so foul but had its divine warrant in the conduct of some god, and in many instances religious worship itself was made to consist of the most shameful orgies. At first the Roman Senate struggled bravely against the abominations practiced in the Bacchanalia and other exotic rites, not shrinking even from executing thousands of participants; but Roman virtue, which had always been entirely human, was not proof against these sensual seductions, and the end was universal corruption. There still were, indeed, individual men and women who clung to their primitive views and longed for higher things; yet they formed but a dwindling minority. Rome was religiously and morally bankrupt.

It was under these conditions that Roman philosophy made

[2] Natura Deor. 3, 36.

its appearance. This, too, was an importation from Greece, and did not strike root until the last years of the Republic. Then a Stoic and an Epicurean school were founded, but neither of them did more than popularize Greek philosophical notions. Of the two, the Epicurean school of thought was at first in greatest favor; its sensual doctrines being widely spread by the poet Lucretius. He ridiculed the national gods, believed in nothing but material nature, and consequently denied the immortality of the soul, which had till then been unhesitatingly accepted by the people. The sum and substance of Epicurean teaching, at least in its later development, comes to this: Eat and drink and make merry, for to-morrow you die. Not precisely that these pleasures were recommended for their own sakes, but that through them might be attained the coveted state of interior tranquillity and satisfaction wherein the Epicureans placed man's greatest and only happiness.

The Stoic school, of which Seneca, Epictetus, and Marcus Aurelius were the best Roman representatives, spread at first more slowly, but in the end outlived Epicureanism. Essentially materialistic in its views, it was destructive of all true concepts of the deity and of the personal immortality of the soul; and in so far it had, like its earlier rival, a demoralizing influence on religion. But on the other hand, its ethics were singularly sane, approaching in outward expression very closely to the Christian code of moral conduct. The chief drawbacks of this ethical teaching were that it eliminated all notions of an overruling Providence, made everything depend on blind fate, and inevitably led to an intolerable self-sufficiency in the practice of virtue. As Seneca worded it, the truly virtuous man is the equal of, nay even superior to the deity; because the deity is virtuous of his very nature, whereas man can become so only through his personal endeavor.

Towards the close of the first century of the Christian era there sprang up by the side of Stoicism, and gradually absorbed it, a new school in which Platonic and Pythagorean doctrines were blended. It borrowed from Plato the idea of one supreme, infinitely perfect, and independent God, the

pre-existence of human souls, and the creation of the world from a primitive *hyle*; whilst from Pythagoras it adopted the doctrine of the transmigration of souls, which led to abstention from animal food and to certain ascetical practices. There was, moreover, in this new philosophy a marked tendency towards dualism, in as much as it more or less tacitly assumed the existence of an evil principle as the ultimate cause of the many evils that disfigure the world. A further though indirect development of this philosophical system resulted in the Neoplatonism of Porphyry and Plotinus, which combined Greek philosophic thought with Oriental mysticism.

2°. *Greek Religious Views: Greek Gods: Greek Philosophy and its Influence on Religion.*—Of the Greeks F. Cumont remarks: "There never was so cultured a people who had so childish a religion." In a certain sense, religion entered into every relation and manifestation of Greek social and private life, but, with the exception of some of their "mysteries," it was a mere dry formalism, a promiscuous collection of empty rites, devoid of all spiritual meaning for the people. There were sacrifices, ablutions, lustrations, divinations, adjurations, and prayers; yet whatever seriously religious suggestion might be contained therein, its effects upon the soul were inevitably counteracted by the trivially human conception of the gods. There was room for tragedy or comedy, as the occasion demanded; but real religious worship seemed strangely out of place.

The Greek gods, like those of the Romans, were personifications of nature-powers, but of a wholly anthropomorphitic character. Like men they are born, eat and drink, have their love affairs, reproduce their kind, and are themselves subject to fate. They have their quarrels, their intrigues; are swayed by hatred and envy, and stoop to all manner of human crimes. They are simply men and women of larger mould and fairer form, of stronger passions and endowed with immortality. This clothing of the gods in human garb was the work of poets. From Homer downwards, each wooer of the Muses wove around his country's gods a network of myths and fables that were partly the heirloom of preceding generations and

partly the offspring of his own poetic fancy. They created their gods to suit the requirements of their theme, put at their service troops of daimones, and ended up by conferring divine honors on the dead heroes of the past and the living despots of the present.

How detrimental an influence this view of the gods exercised upon morality need not be pointed out in detail. The Greeks had indeed a high sense of the beautiful, but, this notwithstanding, they were a most sensual people. Hence as they had in their gods a warrant for all that appealed to their sensuality, they never once thought of blushing for their carnal excesses. Phallus-worship, religious prostitution, paederastia, and *id genus omne,* were supposed to be acceptable to the gods. Especially towards the end of Greek independence, when Oriental influences were strongly felt, worship became orgiastic, and courtesans' statues were erected in several temples to represent Olympian goddesses. The rest may be imagined.

Unlike their later Roman conquerors, the Greeks were an intensely intellectual people, and from their very first appearance in history, literature, both light and serious, played an important part in the nation's life. In the matter of religion and worship, however, poetry and philosophy were in the main mutually antagonistic. Poetry created the gods, whilst philosophy annihilated them. Not that Greek philosophy was atheistic, but nearly all of its representatives threw discredit on the gods of mythology and reasoned to the existence of one supreme being which alone could lay claim to divinity. With the Ionian philosophers and the Stoics this supreme being was of a material nature — fire or ether; but Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle conceived it to be a spiritual substance, in one way or another the ultimate source of all those nature-powers which the common people worshiped as gods. Socrates spoke of this being as a Provident Ruler of the world, Plato regarded it as the Supreme Good, and Aristotle made of it the Prime Mover of the universe. Theirs was not exactly a Christian concept of God, but rather a preparation for it.

This attitude of the philosophers was not without its effect on the educated classes. They lost their respect for the na-

tional gods, without being able to rise to the height of a monotheistic creed. The result was largely religious skepticism and neglect of the traditional forms of worship. Thus the way was opened, not directly for Christianity, but for the mystic cults of the East, which tended to a vague syncretism in religion and to a terrible degradation in morals.

3°. *Oriental Religious Views: Oriental Gods: Oriental Mysticism in Western Lands.*—The Oriental mind is deeply religious, in so far at least as it acknowledges a far-reaching dependence on the divinity, has a keen realization of human sinfulness, evinces a strong bias towards the mystic and occult and shows a great readiness to sacrifice whatever is most dear to the gods and their clients. Hence in all the various forms of Oriental religions, there is an appeal, not to the senses only, as was the case in Rome and Greece, but to the heart as well, although that appeal not rarely led to the most shameful excesses.

Generally speaking, the chief gods of the East, including Egypt, were personifications of nature's productive powers. Baal of the Syro-Phoenicians, Bel of the Babylonians, Osiris of the Egyptians, represented the personified male principle of reproduction, to which corresponded respectively Astarte, Ishtar, and Isis, as the personified female principle. The worship of these gods and goddesses consisted primarily in sacrifices connected with the production of life. Sometimes little children were immolated, while on other occasions the sacrificial rite consisted in religious prostitution, emasculation, and even in bestiality. Secondarily, religious worship took the shape of mystic rites, in which magic played a principal part. In some countries, as Persia, the gods were concretized in the heavenly bodies, as the sun and the moon; in others, as Egypt, they assumed concrete form in certain animals, as the sacred bull and the he-goat. But everywhere they were titanic in their power over the human mind, and usually diabolical in their influence on human morals.[3]

[3] Of all pagan religions that of Persia was the purest and approached most closely to monotheism. Persia was also the home of Mithraism, which spread so widely through Western lands during the second and third centuries of our era. Cfr. Fr. Cumont, The Mysteries of Mithra; Lectures on the History of Religions, II, Mithra.

These mystic rites of the East, and partly also its sacrificial worship, swept over both Greece and Rome shortly before the establishment of the Empire. The result, as already indicated, was disastrous both to religion and to morals. Gods of the most diverse nationalities and characteristics were placed side by side in the same Pantheon, and those religious rites were in highest favor which made the strongest appeal to the beast in man. Augustus made a desperate effort to revive, at least for State purposes, the religious rites of ancient Rome, but he met with only partial success. The last attempt of paganism spent itself in placing the Emperor of Rome among the deities to be worshiped by every loyal subject of the Empire. Pan was dead indeed, and man usurped the place of the gods.

4°. *Final Results.*—From the interaction of these various causes, and of some others not mentioned here, there resulted a state of religious doubt, moral degradation, and spiritual helplessness, that was as universal as it was unique. Many even of the common people no longer believed in their ancient gods, or, still believing, only learned from them to follow freely the promptings of their corrupt nature. Yet through it all there was felt the craving for something stable and certain, for something that would fill the void of men's hearts during life and throw a gleam of light into the darkness beyond the tomb. Originally people had believed in a just retribution after death, but this belief was now shaken by the dogmatizing of materialistic philosophers. What, then, could life mean? And to what must it lead? Was there really one true God beyond the promiscuous Pantheon of their discredited deities, on whom nature depended for its existence and who governed all things according to His own wise ways? Was all the misery of the world perhaps but the result of men's misdeeds? Could all this be changed by a change of life? Whence might help be expected?

5°. *Supposed Dangers to the New Teaching.*—What were the obstacles and helps thus awaiting the advent and spread of Christianity is a matter that belongs to Church History. For the student of the History of Dogmas it is sufficient to

ascertain what there was in contemporary paganism that was likely to corrupt the message of Christ. This, according to Harnack, and perhaps the majority of non-Catholic modern writers on the subject, may be reduced to the following points.

1. The existence of a mighty empire, in which the whole governing power was concentrated in the hands of a single individual, yet exercised through a marvelously organized system of subordinate officials, was a powerful temptation to essay the establishment of a similar empire in spiritual matters, whether the ultimate realization of this lay in the plans of Christ or not.

2. The existence of a mediatorial priesthood, whose members alone claimed the right of immediate access to the deity, was an equally powerful temptation to interpose a similar priesthood between individual Christians and their God.

3. The fact that the Romans had a preëminently legal mind, and that the subjects of the Empire had gradually become accustomed to regard the law as supreme in all things, brought with it the danger that the Evangel of Christ would finally develop into a legal system, which would place upon the Saviour's followers a yoke as unbearable as the one under which the Jews had groaned in the days of old.

4. The wide-spread custom of apotheosis and hero-worship would naturally tend to introduce similar practices among the Christians in regard to the men and women who had deserved well of the faith. Hence the *Cultus Sanctorum,* which was unknown to the children of Israel.

5. The "mysteries" of the Greeks and the mystic rites of the Orient would point the way to the development of a sacramental system, in which mystery and magic would make their appeal to the minds and hearts of Christian worshipers.

6. The widely accepted view of the intrinsically evil nature of matter, especially among the Orientals, would open the way to encratism and a false asceticism.

7. The low tone of pagan morality, particularly in carnal matters, would either be admitted into Christian practice and thus frustrate the reforming efforts of the Saviour, or else lead to extreme views and attempts in the opposite direction.

8. Pagan polytheism, and the accepted belief that the gods appeared at times in human form, would exert a strong influence on the interpretation of Christ's oft-repeated statement that God was His Father.

9. Lastly, and this was the greatest danger of all, as the whole Empire was more or less under the influence of Greek culture and Greek thought, philosophic speculation would incontinently busy itself with Christ and His sayings, and then almost inevitably tend towards reducing His message of salvation to a body of doctrines that might easily admit a large admixture of human elements.[4]

That these so-called dangers, made so much of by Harnack and his school, are, as "dangers," purely imaginary, need hardly be pointed out. It is true, indeed, that all the points enumerated above — the existence of a mighty empire and of a mediatorial priesthood, the legal mind of the Romans and the acknowledged supremacy of the law, the custom of apotheosis and hero-worship, and so on even down to the prevailing influence of Greek culture and Greek thought — are so many historical facts; but that these facts "almost inevitably tended" to corrupt the message of Christ, or actually did corrupt it, can be asserted only by one who totally misunderstands both the message and the person of the Saviour. And it is precisely because of such a misunderstanding that these writers draw from the undoubted facts of history inferences which are wholly unwarranted. Hence what are merely concomitant facts are represented by them as principles of a corrupting influence on the message of Christ.

Thus Harnack and his followers assume that Jesus was purely human and that His sole message to the world was the realization of the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man. Hence, they infer, He did not contemplate the establishment of a world-wide Church, with a consecrated priesthood, an hierarchical government, sacramental means of grace, and full authority to bind and to loosen, to teach and to guide, assured of God's unfailing assistance even to the consummation of the world. Consequently if a Church did spring

[4] Cfr. Harnack, Dogmengeschichte, I, 146 sqq. 4th Germ. edit.

into being, her origin was purely human; and like all other purely human institutions, she necessarily borrowed the fundamental elements of her internal organization, and to some extent also the means of attaining her social aims, from the society in the midst of which she first saw the light of day and then gradually developed into perfect form. As a Christian Church she would, of course, make the message of Christ her message, but in proclaiming that message to the world she would infuse into it her own spirit and interpret it in accordance with her own views; and because of her origin, her spirit was but human and her views were fallible. Hence the danger; hence, too, the actual corruption of Christ's message to the world.

Granting the assumption, all this looks very plausible. If Christ had been only human, though the wisest and saintliest of men; and if the Church had been merely human in her origin, though born of an unselfish desire to save the world; things might well have worked out as here indicated, although the Church herself would long since have ceased to exist. But then the assumption is absolutely false, as will be shown in the following chapters; and upon a false assumption only an untenable theory can be built.

CHAPTER II

ISRAEL AND ITS RELATION TO CHRISTIANITY[1]

That the Jewish people, under the special guidance of Jahve, were in some way instrumental in preparing the world for the advent of the Saviour is admitted by all Christians. Not only was this chosen nation made the depository of a revelation that was to form an integral part of the *depositum fidei* of Christian times, but by its providential contact with the Gentile world it did much to dispose the minds of pagan peoples for the reception of the Saviour's message when the fullness of time had come. This latter preparation had its beginning as far back as the sixth century before Christ, when the Jews of Palestine passed under the domination of Persia, and later on under that of Greece and Rome. Until the Captivity they had been almost exclusively engaged in agriculture, and thus led an isolated existence; but in their subsequent long and intimate contact with enterprising strangers, they acquired a taste for trade, which soon caused them to spread far beyond the borders of their own small country. They gradually established themselves in the numerous commercial cities where Greek was spoken — in all the ports of Western Asia, along the coast of Africa, and even in Rome.

This led to the formation of two distinct groups of one and the same people: the Jews of Palestine, who continued to dwell in the land of their ancestors and were immediately connected with Jerusalem and the Temple; and the Jews of the Diaspora or the Dispersion, who fixed their homes permanently in Gentile lands. Although they remained ever closely

[1] Cfr. Doellinger, op. cit. II; * Schuerer, History of the Jewish People at the Time of Christ; * Drummond, Philo Judæus; Martindale, op. cit. III; Felten, Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte; Tixeront, H. D. I, 20–59.

united in national consciousness, in religious aspirations and mutual interest in each other's varying fortunes, nevertheless in course of time they developed traits and views that were in some respects quite dissimilar. Hence a few remarks on each of these two groups will be in place.

A — The Palestinian Jews: Their Messianic Hopes

The rule of the Persians, which extended from 537 to 330 B. C., was, all things considered, extremely mild, and placed no obstacles in the way of religious and national development. Some influence was indeed exerted on Jewish teaching, especially in the domains of angelology, demonology, and eschatology, but this was by way of quickening development rather than by the absorption and incorporation of foreign doctrines. Thus, although the scepter had in a manner passed from Judah, Jewish national and religious life remained practically intact.

Matters assumed quite a different aspect during the period of Greek domination. In 330 Alexander the Great did homage to the high priest Onias, conquered Persia and all the neighboring countries, and then subjected the Jews to Greek rule. Thenceforth a strong Hellenizing influence was brought to bear upon Jewish customs and manner of life. This reached its climax under Antiochus Epiphanes, who, in 170, attempted the extirpation of the Jewish religion and the conversion of the Temple at Jerusalem into a sanctuary of Jupiter Olympus. The attempt failed of its purpose, yet many there were who from that time on followed the ways of the Greeks.

Shortly after ensued the fierce struggle for liberty under the leadership of the Maccabees, the Asmonean high priests, which resulted in a quasi-independence that lasted for about a hundred years. After that time, in a fratricidal conflict between Aristobulus and Hyrcanus II, an appeal was made to Rome, whereupon Pompey marched with his legions into Palestine, took Jerusalem in 63, and established Roman supremacy throughout the land. Then, by favor of Rome, Herod the Idumean was made king. He oppressed the Jews for 37 years, rebuilt the Temple in a most magnificent style, made

and unmade high priests at will, murdered every one in whom he suspected the slightest opposition, tried all possible schemes to Hellenize the people, and left the country in a ruinous state to his sons. A few years later Rome appointed a procurator, who governed Palestine as a Roman province.

These various political disturbances, and more especially the accompanying religious oppressions, wrought a profound change in the life of the people. Early in the third century before Christ, when the Greeks endeavored to exercise a far-reaching influence on Judaism, three different parties were formed that remained in existence till the destruction of the nation. The first of these was that of the Pharisees, including all lovers of the Law, and therefore the bulk of the people. Prominent in this party were the scribes, who since the Captivity had become the authorized expounders of the Law. To it also belonged those priests who were not mere tools in the hands of the ruling power. Because of their great zeal for the Law, these Pharisees and scribes erected around it a "gader" or hedge, consisting of traditions and interpretations which in course of time were regarded as binding as the Law itself. It was chiefly these "traditions of men" that made the Law so burdensome, and later on caused the name of Pharisee to stand for a mere outward show of righteousness. Hence Christ's terrible denunciation of them as recorded in the Gospel. Sprung from a legitimate zeal for the Law, the party ended by betraying the Law to its own private interests.

The second party was that of the Sadducees, the reputed disciples of Sadok (291-260), who adopted the principles of the Hellenists. They repudiated the traditions of the Pharisees, disregarded the "gader," and appealed almost exclusively to the Thora, without, however, rejecting the other books of the Old Testament. In philosophy, although admitting the creation of the world in the accepted Jewish sense, they were followers of Epicurus, denying God's continuous operation in the universe, the immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the dead, and the existence of angels. Yet in spite of this, they took part in the services and sacrifices of the Temple,

practiced circumcision, observed the Sabbath, and wished to be considered as real Jews. In social life, however, they conducted themselves as Greeks.

The third party, numerically insignificant, was that of the Essenes, a body of ascetics, who based their asceticism partly on Judaism and partly on Greek philosophy. They clung tenaciously to the Mosaic Law, but at the same time admitted many non-Jewish elements in their religious practices and beliefs. In some respects there is a close resemblance between their mode of life and that of early Christian ascetics, but no genetic relation can be shown to exist.

There is no particular need of reviewing here the theological doctrines of the Palestinian Jews, as we find them practically all reproduced in the Gospels and in the preaching of the Apostles. Still a brief outline seems to be in place. The following points will be sufficient for our purpose.

1°. *God: The Blessed Trinity.*—Although the Jews, in spite of the prohibition of the law, came in frequent contact with idolaters and on divers occasions many individuals yielded to the fascination of foreign cults, nevertheless as a nation they were strict monotheists. From the first page of the Old Testament to the last, Elohim, or Jahve, is consistently represented as the one and only God. And the same teaching is also found in later apocryphal writings. Nor is He considered merely as a national deity, but as the one true God of all men and the whole world; although for providential reasons He made the children of Israel His own special people. The pagan gods are spoken of as Elilim (worthless), or as demons, who are no gods at all, but are foolishly worshiped as such by the wicked. Some day Jahve will bring back the Gentiles to His service. The existence of this one God is nowhere proved in the Sacred Writings; it is assumed as evident, and only "the fool saith in his heart there is no God."

God is a spirit, whom no man can see and live. He is being itself; without beginning and without end, unchangeable alike in perfection and counsel. He knows all things, and nothing is hidden from His eyes. He fills all things and all space with His presence, and of His wisdom, justice, and

mercy there is no end. All these attributes, however, are usually spoken of in a concrete way, to suit the understanding of a simple people. Anthropomorphisms and plural designations occur rather frequently; but the context, either proximate or remote, contains its own corrective.

The mystery of the Blessed Trinity is not explicitly taught in the Old Testament, but allusions to it are found in not a few texts. The expression in Genesis, "Let us make man to our image and likeness: . . . and God created man to his image: to the image of God he created him," may be said to be an implicit statement of the Trinitarian doctrine as understood in Christian times. The plurality of divine persons is rather clearly taught in the Book of Proverbs and Ecclesiasticus, where Wisdom is represented as a distinct hypostasis. But whether the Jews realized the full import of these texts is not so certain. The doctrine implied in these and similar passages becomes clear only when the Old Testament is read in the light shed upon it by the New. To this as to many other Christian doctrines contained in the Old Testament is applicable the saying of St. Augustine: "In Vetere Novum latet, et in Novo Vetus patet."

2°. *God's Relation to the World.*—By an act of His omnipotent will, Jahve drew all things out of nothingness; and He can again reduce them all to nothingness by withdrawing His sustaining power. He holds the world in the hollow of His hand. Yet He is a good and wise Providence, who loves His creatures and fills them all with blessings. "Good things and evil, life and death, poverty and riches, are from God." Creatures are an outward expression of His goodness, yet ultimately they must all serve to promote His glory; because He has made them for Himself, and His glory He will not give to another.

3°. *Angels and Men.*—Good and bad angels appear on the very first pages of the Bible; for Satan under the appearance of a serpent brought about man's fall, and after the fall Cherubims were appointed to guard the gates of paradise. These angels are everywhere represented as spirits, endowed with intellect and free will. More perfect than men, they are

nevertheless created beings, although their creation is nowhere recorded in explicit terms. Their fidelity to their Maker was subjected to a trial, and some of them proved unfaithful. These latter appear as workers of evil. The good angels are the messengers of God and the bearers of His commands to men. They protect both individuals and nations, whilst the evil spirits seek to encompass man's ruin. Only a few of either class are known by name; but of the good, at least, there are vast multitudes. For "thousands of thousands ministered to Him, and ten thousand times a hundred thousand stood before Him." It may be noted in passing, that there is no real resemblance between these angels, as represented in the Old Testament, and the genii and daimones of pagan mythology; though many critics hold that Persian angelology had some influence on the later development of Jewish belief in this matter.

After the angels, in the order of natural perfection, man appears as the noblest of God's creatures. He was made to the image and likeness of God. His body was formed of the slime of the earth, and his soul was "breathed into his face" by his Maker. He is, therefore, made up of two distinct elements; a material body and a spiritual soul. He is physically free to choose between good and evil; but he is morally bound to render faithful service to his Creator. In perfection he is a little less than the angels.

Between him and God exists not only the relation of servant and Master, but also of child and Father. This latter relation is not brought out very distinctly in the Pentateuch, but it appears quite prominently in the Psalms and the Prophetical Books. Man's elevation to the supernatural state is only implied in most of the texts that refer to his primitive condition, though there are a few that are usually interpreted as stating it explicitly. Originally he was destined for temporal and eternal happiness, but both were made dependent on his fidelity to God. He proved unfaithful and lost both. However, owing to the great mercy of God, his eternal happiness was again made possible. The first man's fall is the origin of all evil in the world.

Reinstated in God's friendship, in view of the merits of a future Redeemer, the making of his fortune is once more placed in man's own hands. A terrible conflict between his inclinations to good and evil is inevitable; but in this conflict God is on his side. In what precisely the divine assistance consists is not clearly stated; yet it is represented as enabling men both to know, to will, and to do what is right, and thus to become holy even as God is holy. As required of the chosen people, this holiness demands both legal and moral purity, so that in practice it is identical with the keeping of the ceremonial and the moral law. For the Gentiles, however, the moral law alone is of obligation.

Adam's fall and the subsequent sinfulness of all men stand out prominently in the various books of the Old Testament, and they give a distinct coloring to later apocryphal literature. Yet with all this, there is little said in either class of writings about the existence and transmission of original sin. In the canonical books several texts are pointed out by theologians, and also by some of the Fathers, as containing the doctrine; but others interpret these texts in a different sense. Perhaps the clearest reference to the inheritance of a moral stain from Adam is found in the fourth book of Esdras, where we read: "O tu, quid fecisti, Adam? Si enim tu peccasti, non est factus solius tuus casus, sed et noster qui ex te advenimus" (7,48).

Forgiveness could be obtained for all sins, however grievous and many, provided the sinner was truly repentant and confessed his sinfulness before God. But even in the case of true repentance, and consequent forgiveness of sin, temporal chastisement was not rarely inflicted by the justice of Jahve. Under certain conditions, moreover, sin-offerings were required, but they had no real sacramental efficacy. It was the conversion of the heart that counted — true sorrow for sins and a firm purpose of future amendment.

4°. *The Law of Worship Comprised Two Parts: Sacrifices and the Sanctification of the Sabbath.*—Sacrifices could be offered only by the priests, who by divine ordination were of

the family of Aaron. They were presided over by the high priest, whose succession to office was by heredity, and originally he could be removed only by death or on account of some great crime. In the preparation of the victims the priests were assisted by Levites. Menial offices connected with the sacrificial worship were performed by Temple slaves. After the Temple had been built, sacrifices could be offered only in Jerusalem. The beneficiaries of these sacrifices were, according to circumstances, both individuals and the whole nation. This sacrificial and ceremonial law, however, was intended to be only temporary; after the advent of the Messias it was to be replaced by a more spiritual worship.

The sanctification of the Sabbath consisted exclusively in rest from unnecessary work, although in later times it was customary to gather in the synagogues, where portions of the Thora, the Prophets, and other Holy Books were read aloud and explained. This custom seems to have originated with Esdras, after the Captivity. At the conclusion of the homily the people were dismissed by a blessing of the priest, the congregation answering, Amen. Here, as we shall see later, we have the type of Christian worship as gathered around the sacrifice of the New Law.

5°. *The Family Was by Divine Institution Monogamous, and Divorce a vinculo Was Originally Prohibited.*—However, owing to their "hardness of heart," the Jews later on obtained a dispensation in this matter, so that thereafter a man could lawfully have several wives simultaneously, and for anything "shameful" could dismiss one or all of them by giving a "*libellus repudii.*" The wife, on the other hand, had no right of divorce, although when duly dismissed she was allowed to marry again.

6°. *Eschatology.*—The Jewish doctrine concerning the final consummation of things does not appear very clearly defined. As a sanction of the moral law, the hereafter plays a rather subordinate part in both canonical and apocryphal writings. It is usually rewards and punishments during the present life that are held out as inducements to render God faithful serv-

ice; yet these rewards and punishments are not disconnected with, and exclusive of, a continued existence beyond the tomb. The following points will make this clear.

Death and judgment are consecutive, so that one follows immediately upon the other; for "it is easy before God in the day of death to reward every one according to his works." That this was also the popular belief is necessarily presupposed in Christ's parable of Dives and Lazarus. Besides the retribution immediately after death, there is to be a general judgment at the end of time, which will inaugurate each one's eternal condition. In Jewish apocryphal literature, however, this general judgment is usually brought into close connection with the Messias' reign on earth, either forming its beginning or its end. It shall be preceded by a resurrection of the dead, which Daniel and Joel represent as general, but which the Apocryphas limit to the Jews or just alone, who shall have a share in the Messianic reign.

What were the expected conditions of the great hereafter is somewhat obscurely expressed. Judging from what is said in the Book of Henoch and IV Esdras, Jewish belief was that there would be a temporal happiness or misery until the final sentence of the Great Judge. In the Psalms, on the other hand, the temporal abode of the dead is spoken of only in a general way, and pictured in rather dark colors. It is a still, gloomy spot, apparently in the bowels of the earth, where souls are indeed at rest from the troubles of the world above, but where they seem to lead a dull, inactive, and comfortless existence Job's description of it strikes one as still more terrible. Of course, as we know from New Testament teaching that even the just could not enter heaven until the ascension of the Saviour, this gloomy view of the hereafter may be understood as bearing reference only to the delay of eternal beatitude.

At the last judgment, Daniel tells us, "some shall rise unto life everlasting, and others unto reproach, to see it always." And Job expects, after that dark intermediate condition, a happy eternity: for "I know that my Redeemer liveth; He will stand as the last one on the dust of my grave; my eyes

shall behold Him, and no stranger." The same is also the hope of the Psalmist. The wicked, on the other hand, shall be cast into Gehenna, where, according to Isaias, they shall dwell with devouring fire, with everlasting burnings. To purgatory there is no direct reference, save only in II Maccabees, where it is stated as the Jewish belief that it is a holy and a wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from their sins.

After this general outline of Old Testament teaching, and of current Jewish beliefs as gathered from apocryphal writings, it seems much to our purpose to give a somewhat more detailed account of Israel's Messianic hope, since the realization of this forms the very central point of the Gospel message. The following paragraphs contain a fairly complete though brief statement.

Messianic prophecies are found scattered through the whole of the Old Testament, and find a clear echo in later apocryphal writings. Beginning with the rather obscure announcement of a future Saviour immediately after the fall,[2] these predictions become clearer and more definite as time passes on. The Messias is to be of the posterity of Abraham,[3] of the tribe of Judah,[4] of the family of David.[5] He shall be preceded by the angel of the Lord, and shall glorify the second Temple.[6] He shall be of virgin birth,[7] shall be born in Bethlehem of Juda,[8] sixty-nine weeks of years "from the going forth of the word, to build up Jerusalem again," [9] after the scepter has passed from Judah.[10] He shall be Emanuel, God with us; His name shall be called Wonderful, God the Mighty, Counselor, Prince of Peace.[11] He shall grow up as a child of poverty in the land of Galilee,[12] shall be of a most lovable character, quiet and gentle, the friend of the poor and forsaken.[13] He shall cause the blind to see, the dumb to

[2] Gen. 3, 15.
[3] Ibid. 12, 1–3; 21, 15–18.
[4] Ibid. 49, 1–10.
[5] I Par. 17, 4, 10, 11; II Kings, 7, 13–16.
[6] Mal. 3, 1; Agg. 2, 7–11.
[7] Is. 7, 14.
[8] Mich. 5, 2.
[9] Dan. 9, 21–25.
[10] Gen. 49, 1–10.
[11] Is. 7, 14; 9, 6.
[12] Ibid. 9, 1, 2; 53, 2.
[13] Ibid. 42, 1–4.

speak and the lame to walk.[14] But in the end He shall be disowned by His own people, betrayed by His friend, subjected to untold sufferings, so that He is verily a worm and no man.[15] In the middle of the last week of years, He shall be slain, confirming the New Covenant. Then great tribulations shall ensue, the sacrifice of the Law shall fail, and a people with their leaders shall come to destroy the city and the sanctuary, and in the Temple there shall be the abomination of desolation, and the desolation shall continue even to the consummation and the end.[16] But His sepulcher shall be glorious.[17]

He shall be a prophet greater than Moses,[18] a priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech,[19] a king who shall sit on the throne of David and rule from sea to sea, and of His kingdom there shall be no end.[20] Yet this kingdom shall be of a spiritual order, to be established on Sion, the Holy Mount, whither the Gentiles shall flock from all parts of the world.[21] In it there shall be a new sacrifice, a clean oblation, which shall be offered everywhere, from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof, and Jahve's name shall be great among the Gentiles.[22] And because this priest-king shall lay down His life for sin, hence He shall see a long-lived seed, and the will of the Lord shall be prosperous in His hand.[23]

This is the prophetic view of the Messias, the inspired teaching of the Old Testament; but with this the popular view only partly coincided. The people were at all times firmly convinced that a Messias would come, yet the manner of His coming and the work He was to accomplish were variously colored by the needs and hopes of each particular epoch. The prophetic predictions were scattered over a vast period of time; in themselves they appeared but as so many *membra disjecta,* which, taken singly, impressed no well defined picture upon the popular mind. Hence it is not at all unintelligible that, in spite of the prophetic corrective, the long train

[14] Ibid. 42, 6, 7; 35, 5, 6.
[15] Ibid. 53, 2–9.
[16] Dan. 9, 26, 27.
[17] Is. 53, 9; Ps. 15, 10.
[18] Deut. 18, 15.
[19] Ps. 109, 4.
[20] Zach. 9, 9, 10.
[21] Ps. 2, 6–10.
[22] Mal. 1, 11.
[23] Is. 53, 10–12.

of national disasters should have suggested to the despairing Jews the hope of an all-conquering Messias, who, as an earthly king, would crush the enemies of the chosen people. He was to be David's son; the father had been the most powerful king of Israel's glorious past: could then the son be less? Was it not Jerusalem that was so clearly designated as the seat of His rule and the capital of His kingdom, where His throne was to be erected, and whither all the costly offerings of the Gentiles, their silver and their gold, were to flow together? Hard pressed by their conquerors, the Jews readily interpreted these prophetic promises in a purely material sense, and the natural result was that they looked forward to an earthly ruler, who would restore the golden age of the nation's past. Should He come in any other form or guise, they would not have Him.

However, it would be a mistake to think that the whole Jewish nation had abandoned the prophetic idea of a spiritual Messias. Many there still were, both among the lowly and the high, whose expectations found adequate expression in the "Nunc dimittis" of the holy old man Simeon, who was privileged to press the Child Jesus to his faithful heart on the occasion of the Saviour's presentation in the Temple. This appears not only from the Gospels, which record how the people were always ready to proclaim Jesus the long expected Messiás, in spite of His humble and lowly appearance, but also from the apocryphal writings which originated in the century before Christ. In them the Messianic kingdom is called "the assembly of the just," which no one can enter except through penance.[24] The sovereign of this kingdom is holy and sinless, and no injustice shall be found in his realm.[25] Hence the constantly repeated prayer: "O God, purify Israel on the day of healing grace, when its Anointed of the Lord shall come," and when "a good generation shall live in the fear of God and in the works of justice." [26] Still this realization of the truth gradually disappeared from the

[24] Enoch, 38, 1.
[25] Ps. Sal. 17, 26, 41.
[26] Ibid. 18, 6. Cfr. L. Fonk, Parables of the Gospel, 59–63; Engl. Transl. by E. Leahy.

minds of those who directed the hopes of the chosen people, and hence when Jesus came unto His own, " His own received Him not."

B—The Jews of the Dispersion: Their Religious and Philosophical Views

The Jews of the Dispersion, also called Hellenistic Jews, remained in the main faithful to the religious teaching of the Old Testament, yet their close contact with Greek culture and thought led them in many instances to put new interpretations upon statements of the Bible which they had theretofore accepted in a literal sense. Many of them came gradually to believe that Moses and the Greek philosophers were on a large number of points in substantial agreement, their teaching differing chiefly in their respective viewpoints and in the terminology which they employed. To eliminate even this difference, and to arrive at a more perfect understanding, they had recourse to an allegorical method of interpretation, which on the one hand did away with the fabulous mythology of the Greeks, and on the other enriched the rather meager philosophy of the Jews. It was this allegorical method of interpretation that was later on rendered so famous by the Christian scholars of Alexandria.

Whilst treasuring the Sacred Books of their Palestinian home, these Hellenistic Jews gradually developed a religious literature of their own. The Greek translation of the LXX, the Book of Wisdom, the Second Book of Maccabees, and some deutero-canonical additions of other books, originated in their midst. So, too, did the apocryphal Third and Fourth Book of Maccabees, the Letter of the Pseudo-Aristeas, the Sibyline Oracles, and others. The fundamental doctrines of these various writings are generally identical with those contained in the Palestinian Old Testament, yet there are shades of differences that point to Greek influence. Anthropomorphisms are usually avoided when speaking of God, the personification of the Word is very marked, Messianic hopes are brought out but faintly, and much space is given to the consideration of man's condition after death.

The one who tried most persistently to bring Jewish and Greek thought into closer relation was Philo, at once a believer and a philosopher. Not that he ultimately succeeded in his purpose, or could have; but along certain lines his influence was felt for centuries, even in Christian circles. The principal Jewish doctrines on which he stamped his philosophic mark may thus be summarized.[27]

1°. *The nature of God.*—After the Platonic fashion, he looks upon God as wholly transcendent, of whom nothing definite can be affirmed; for any affirmation places a limit in the Godhead, and is of its very nature exclusive of other properties. He is simply WHO IS. Although He is eternal, immutable, free; yet He is without any quality or property whatever. He is so transcendent that He can have no direct contact with finite beings.

2°. Hence to explain the production of the world, Philo gathers together the teaching of Plato about pre-existing ideas, of the Stoics about the world-soul, of the Bible about the angels, and of Greek mythology about the demons, and out of these heterogeneous elements he constructs what may be called pre-existent dynamic ideas, which are the intermediaries of God's action upon the world, the Logoi through which He works. Whether or not these Logoi are really distinct from God, Philo does nowhere clearly state; yet, on the one hand, they must be distinct, for their purpose is to keep God from immediate contact with the world and to save Him from being the author of evil; but, on the other hand, they cannot be distinct from God, since it is through them that the finite is brought into contact and participation with the infinite. Hence logically, these dynamic ideas are self-contradictory.

And so, too, seems to be the concept of the Universal Logos, of which these dynamic ideas are partial or limited expressions. This Universal Logos is designated as God's image, God's shadow, God's first-born son, another or a second God.

[27] The following summary of Philo's teaching has in part been taken from Tixeront, H. D. I, 49–54; and from Drummond's Philo Judæus, cc. 4, 5, 6, vol. II. Cfr. Feder, Justins Lehre von Jesus Christus, 137–143; Felten, op. cit. I, 564, sqq. II, 19 sqq.

Yet in himself he is but the sum and substance or rather a combination of the various powers through which God acts upon the world, and therefore merely an intermediary between God and the created universe. Hence Philo says of him that he is neither unbegotten like God, nor begotten like us, but in "an intermediary way." What this "intermediary way" is, Philo does not know, or at least he does not attempt to explain it, and so the whole concept seems to evanesce because of its intrinsic repugnance.

In this connection it is well to note that Philo never hints at the identity of this Logos with the Messias. And furthermore, notwithstanding such designations as first-born son of God, another God, this Logos does not appear to have a real concrete personality, but to be simply a demiurgic and cosmic power, wholly alien from a God Revealer and Redeemer. Hence, if St. John borrowed his terminology from Philo, which is not at all certain, he surely did not go to him for the contents of his doctrine.

3°. *The Work of Creation.*—Although Philo bears witness to the traditional belief in a creation out of nothing, he himself seems to have followed Plato in assuming the existence of an eternal *hyle,* the source of all imperfection and evil, which God reduced to order by the agency of the dynamic forces indicated above, and then into portions of it He introduced a divine element as the source of physical and intellectual life, according to the nature of each being.

In the order of sequence Philo follows more or less strictly the Mosaic account of creation, speaking first of the angels, which in his treatment very closely resemble Plato's inferior gods. They are distributed in different spheres, one above the other. The highest are exclusively occupied with the service of God; others, nearer the earth, have united themselves to bodies and become the souls of men. Bad angels, or demons, he identifies with evil souls.

Man is made up of three elements: the intellect, "the soul of the soul," which comes from God; the inferior soul, which is propagated by generation; and the body. In this Philo teaches trichotomy, a doctrine that later on appeared some-

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

times in Christian writers. The human body, being made up of matter, is conceived as essentially evil. Its mere contact defiles the soul. Hence man is of his very nature inclined to moral iniquity, and of himself he is powerless against the promptings of his lower instincts. With this, however, the author nowhere connects the idea of original sin, as contracted in the fall of Adam.

Because man is thus inclined to evil, hence there is need of ascetical practices, that he may be enabled to lead a life of virtue and become acceptable to his Maker. Yet these ascetical practices alone do not suffice; there is also need of philosophy and science, in the sum total of which the perfection of virtue finally consists. There is a certain Stoic element in all this, yet without the Stoics' self-sufficiency and pride; for, in the last instance, it is the help of God that is man's strength. Thus assisted by God, and making proper use of contemplation, we may realize even here on earth a sort of intuitive vision of God's perfection, which is the final aim of all true philosophy.

That this teaching of Judaism, both in its purer form as found in the Palestinian group and in its somewhat modified contents as developed among the Jews of the Diaspora, would exert an influence on later Christian thought is quite obvious. "Salvation is from the Jews," said our Divine Saviour, and so likewise was the early preaching of the Gospel. The Apostles and first disciples of the Lord had been trained up in the doctrines of the Old Testament, and some of their immediate successors were deeply imbued with Hellenistic thought. Nor was there in this any great danger to the purity of the Gospel message. Outward expression of revealed doctrines might bear the impress of the preacher's early associations; forms of speech might be used that would be calculated to puzzle later generations; certain elements of the Saviour's teaching might be emphasized and others barely stated in a casual way: but all this did not necessarily imply that the Evangel of Christ would either be coerced into the narrow compass of the Mosaic Law, or flow out unhindered into the shoreless ocean of Greek speculation. The issue

would depend on the promised measure of divine assistance; for if the message was divine, its subsequent propagation and conservation must depend on a help that was equally divine. In this a merely human care and human wisdom would be insufficient. What did happen will appear in the sequel.

CHAPTER III

NEW TESTAMENT TEACHING ON THE FUNDAMENTAL TRUTHS OF CHRISTIANITY

To the general outline of revealed truths contained in the Old Testament, as given in the preceding chapter, must now be added a summary statement of the Gospel message. The two together will enable us to form a proper appreciation of doctrinal development, as it is portrayed in the History of Dogmas. However, as this statement must necessarily be very brief, it appears advisable to confine our observations to such points of doctrine as are of greater fundamental importance, and for that reason recur constantly in the preaching of the Gospel. These are Christ's own teaching on the kingdom of heaven and on the life eternal, St. Paul's doctrine on the Church of Christ, and the doctrinal data on the mystery of the Blessed Trinity and on the person of the Saviour, both as found in the Gospels and in the Epistles of St. Paul. The reason for thus placing St. Paul's Epistles on a level with the Gospels, and treating them as an independent source of revealed truth, lies in the fact that he received his gospel not of man, but from the revelation of Jesus Christ.[1] The message which the Saviour announced personally, as recorded by the Evangelists, He also announced through Paul, whom He made "a vessel of election."

A—Christ's Teaching on the Kingdom of Heaven[2]

In one sense the doctrine of the kingdom of heaven runs through the whole New Testament, and is set forth as clearly and fully by St. John and St. Paul as by the first three Evan-

[1] G. I, 11, 12.

[2] Cfr. Yves de La Briere, in the Dictionnaire Apologetique, art. Eglise, I, 1221–1301.

gelists; yet in another sense it is found almost exclusively in the Synoptic Gospels. St. John and St. Paul use the term, but only incidentally; they throw the Saviour's teaching on the kingdom into another form, the one speaking of it as the life eternal and the other as the Church of Christ. The contents, as we shall see, are the same in each case; but the form differs. And it is this difference of form that makes it advisable to consider separately the three several aspects of one and the same doctrine. Hence in this first section we shall confine our remarks to the teaching of Jesus on the kingdom of heaven as recorded by the Synoptists.

The doctrine of the kingdom may be said to be the fundamental idea that underlies the Synoptic Gospels. St. Mark and St. Luke usually speak of it as the kingdom of God, and St. Matthew as the kingdom of heaven. The two expressions are identical in sense, and properly signify the reign or domination of God, as appears from the Greek text. In its main outline and general concept, this doctrine of the kingdom presents an Old Testament idea, and coincides with the prophetic view of the Messianic reign.[3] Some modern critics take this kingdom, as portrayed in the Synoptic Gospels, to be exclusively eschatological in character, holding that Christ regarded its establishment as coincident with the end of time. However, the various texts bearing on the subject make it quite clear that the term is used in a threefold sense. In some passages the kingdom is obviously considered in its final consummation, as God's kingdom of the elect already in possession of their eternal reward, and in this sense it is purely eschatological. In other places it is referred to as present and established here on earth, either as including both the just and the unjust in a state of preparation, or as including only the just who here and now comply with all the conditions it imposes; evidently in neither of these two connections does it bear an eschatological import. It is as much a part of the actual present as is the field in which wheat and cockle are allowed to grow until the time of the harvest.[4] Hence the Baptist

[3] Cfr. L. Fonk, Parables of the Gospels, 53–63.

[4] Matt. 13, 24–30.

announced it as close at hand, and Jesus declared that it had appeared with His advent.[5]

The kingdom is first announced to the Jews, but it is intended for all.[6] Hence the Apostles must preach it to all nations, and before the consummation of the ages the glad tidings must spread over the whole world.[7] It shall grow as a mustard seed, and pervade the life of individuals and of society as a leaven, changing the whole mass. Yet, though all are called to this kingdom, admittance into it can be secured only on certain conditions. These may be summed up as faith in the divine message, penance for past misdeeds, attachment to the person of Christ, readiness to confess Him before men, an humble and docile heart, purity of morals, and helpfulness to the neighbor.[8]

The ruler of this kingdom is God; yet not the Father alone, but also the Son. The Father is the "householder who planted a vineyard, and made a hedge round about it, and dug a press, and built a tower, and let it out to husbandmen"; but the Son "is the heir," whom the faithless husbandmen killed, yet could not deprive of "his inheritance." He was sent by the Father, and He Himself sent others, giving the "kingdom to a nation yielding the fruits thereof."[9]

Under one aspect this kingdom is interior, the reign of justice in the hearts of men; but it also has a social side. Christ Himself calls it an *ecclesia*, a church, for which He is making preparation in the establishment of the Apostolic college. He will build it upon Peter, the Rock, who shall be its indestructible foundation. For this purpose He will give to Peter the keys of the kingdom, supreme power to bind and to loosen here on earth, in such wise that his actions shall be ratified in heaven.[10] As the head of the Church, Peter's faith shall never fail, and he shall confirm his brethren.[11] With him are associated the other Apostles, who shall also receive power to bind and to loosen;[12] they are all sent to

[5] Ibid. 3, 2; 12, 28.
[6] Ibid. 10, 5, 6.
[7] Ibid. 28, 19.
[8] Ibid. 11, 12; 5, 3–12.
[9] Ibid. 21, 33–45.
[10] Ibid. 16, 13–19.
[11] Luke, 22, 32.
[12] Matt. 18, 19.

baptize and to teach, and they must be listened to as Jesus Himself.[13]

Admission into this Church is by baptism in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.[14] This baptism, together with faith, is necessary for salvation.[15] Once admitted into the Church, the members thereof must partake of a Eucharistic meal, at which they eat the body and drink the blood of the Saviour. This rite is performed in obedience to Christ's explicit command, and commemorates the immolation of Himself for the sins of the world.[16]

In their intercourse with one another they must be mindful of the great law of charity, loving not only their brethren and friends, but also their enemies and persecutors, bearing injuries gladly for Christ's sake, forgiving offenses, and readily sacrificing their own interests for the good of their neighbor. They must keep their hearts pure and detached, and be perfect as also their Heavenly Father is perfect.[17] This is required of all, but if some wish to aim at higher things, let them sell all they have, give the price of their goods to the poor, leave father and mother, and follow the Master in voluntary poverty, chastity and obedience.[18]

Here on earth the kingdom of God, which is thus the Church of Christ, includes both good and bad, wheat and cockle; but the day of separation will come, and this will be twofold. An individual separation takes place immediately after death, when those who have followed Dives shall be buried with him in hell, whilst those others who have suffered patiently like Lazarus shall be at peace in Abraham's bosom.[19] Then there will be another separation at the end of time, a judgment of the whole world, when every one shall be rewarded or punished according to his deeds. This will be preceded by a general resurrection of the dead,[20] so that body and soul may share a common fate. The wicked shall go into everlasting fire, enkindled for the devil and his angels; and

[13] Luke, 10, 16.
[14] Matt. 28, 19.
[15] Mark, 16, 16.
[16] Ibid. 26, 26–29.
[17] Matt. 5, 19–48.
[18] Ibid. 19, 21.
[19] Luke, 16, 19–21.
[20] Ibid. 20, 37, 38; Matt. 5, 29.

the just shall possess forever the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world.[21]

B—The Life Eternal

Corresponding to the kingdom of God as portrayed by the Synoptists, we find in St. John's account a presentation of life eternal. The proper object of the mission of Jesus is not to judge the world, but to save it; to give it eternal life. "Now this is eternal life; that they may know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent." [22] Hence Jesus is the light, "which enlighteneth every man that cometh into this world.[23] He is to give His flesh for the life of His followers; He is the Good Shepherd who dies for His flock. All this is in accord with the command He has received from His Father. Yet no one takes His life away from Him, but He lays it down of His own free will; and as He has power to lay it down, so has He also power to take it up again.[24]

This eternal life is intended for all men, because "God so loved the world as to give his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him may not perish, but may have life everlasting." [25] But in regard to some this intention of God is not realized; for "men love darkness rather than the light," and so instead of allowing themselves to be "drawn by the Father," they follow their own will and trust in their own devices.[26] They refuse to comply with the conditions laid down for entrance into eternal life, the chief of which is attachment to Jesus.[27] They must belong to His sheepfold; they must be united to Him even as the branches are united to the vine.[28]

In its completeness this eternal life is twofold: it begins here on earth and reaches its final perfection in heaven. In so far as it has its inception on earth, it does not consist only in the perfection of individual souls, but it also implies a close union with the social organization of which Christ Him-

[21] Ibid. 25, 31–45.
[22] John, 17, 3.
[23] Ibid. 1, 9.
[24] Ibid. 10, 17, 18.
[25] Ibid. 3, 16.
[26] Ibid. 3, 19.
[27] Ibid. 15, 7–10.
[28] Ibid. 10, 14–17, 15, 5–8.

self lays the foundation during His three years of public teaching. He gathers around Him twelve Apostles, whom He endows with His own authority, and sends out into the world even as he was sent by the Father.[29] He sanctifies Himself for them, and prays that they, and all who believe through their word, may be one as He and the Father are one.[30] He promises them the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete, who will teach them all things and remain with them forever.[31]

Hence, although He, the Good Shepherd, must go to the Father, His sheepfold shall remain. For its preservation He makes one of His Apostles His own substitute, appointing him as chief shepherd in His own stead, with the power and the duty of feeding His lambs and His sheep.[32] His mission is to be continued by all the Apostles; they are all sent to preach and to teach, to forgive and to retain sins through the Holy Spirit who is given them; but to Peter alone is the care of the whole flock entrusted. Thus the sheepfold is identical with the Church which is built on Peter. St. John's thoughts are cast in a different mold; his terms and expressions are peculiarly his own; but the contents of his doctrine are the same as that of the Synoptists, because both represent the doctrine of Christ.

As no one "can enter into the kingdom of God, unless he be born again of water and the Holy Ghost," [33] entrance into the Church is evidently obtained through baptism; and once admitted into it, the members thereof must "eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood," or they shall not have life in them.[34] Furthermore, they must all believe in Jesus, hear the voice of the Shepherd and follow him, so that there may be but one fold and one shepherd. Under these conditions the Church is open to all, and any one may enter and remain in the fold; for besides the Jews, the Good Shepherd has other sheep; them also must He bring.[35]

On the other hand, those who will not comply with the

[29] Ibid. 20, 21.
[30] Ibid. 17, 4–25.
[31] Ibid. 16, 13–15.
[32] Ibid. 21, 15–17; 20, 21–23.
[33] Ibid. 3, 5.
[34] Ibid. 6, 54–64.
[35] Ibid. 10, 3–16.

conditions here laid down, and whose works are evil, by that very fact judge themselves.[36] In this sense the judgment, which is to follow death, already begins in the present life, and determines each one's condition in the world to come. But this judgment will be followed by another one at the end of time, when all shall rise again and receive the recompense of their mortal deeds. For "the hour cometh, wherein all that are in their graves shall hear the voice of the Son of God; and they that have done good things, shall come forth unto the resurrection of life; but they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of the judgment."[37] This final retribution will be the full development of each one's condition here on earth: for the just the full possession of life in consequence of their union with Christ; for the wicked, death and God's wrath always standing against them.[38]

C—St. Paul's Doctrine on the Church of Christ

Christ's teaching on the kingdom of heaven and on the life eternal, as recorded by the Synoptists and St. John respectively, represents the Church as an institution still in the course of formation. It had its beginning indeed during the Saviour's life time, in as much as the foundation was then laid and the necessary powers were either promised or actually conferred; but it was to stand forth as a complete organization only after He had ascended to the Father. Then the Holy Ghost came down upon the Apostles, as had been promised by Jesus, and the Church entered upon her divine mission of saving the world. It is under this aspect that St. Paul speaks of the Church of Christ.

In many respects his presentation of the subject coincides closely with that of St. John, in as much as he emphasizes the intimate union that exists between the Church and her Founder. He speaks of her as the body of Christ, the spouse of the Saviour, made immaculate by His cleansing blood.[39] Jesus is her head, the center of her unity, the source of her

[36] Ibid. 3, 18; cfr. 12, 48.
[37] Ibid. 5, 28, 29.
[38] Ibid. 3, 36.
[39] Ephes. 5, 23–30.

organic life.[40] Then, too, the Spirit of Truth abides in her, and makes her the pillar and groundwork of truth.[41] In the "one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Gentiles, whether bond or free; and in one Spirit we have all been made to drink."[42] Hence the Holy Spirit, together with Christ, is the source of life to the Church and the bond of union among the faithful.

The Church is an organized society, in which there are many ministries, but they all come from the same Spirit.[43] Men of approved virtue are constituted to govern each particular community of believers. Some of them are overseers or bishops, others presbyters, others deacons.[44] The bishops, either by themselves or together with the presbyters, must instruct the faithful, preach sound doctrine, and rebuke the gainsayers;[45] they must also ordain fit candidates for these sacred functions by the imposition of hands.[46]

Repeated mention is made of certain sacred rites, all more or less intimately connected with the social life of the Church. The first of these is baptism which symbolizes the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, and effects a spiritual regeneration in the soul.[47] This is followed by the imposition of hands, whereby the Holy Spirit is imparted to the newly baptized.[48] Then there is the Eucharistic meal, which is the body and blood of Jesus, is commemorative of His death, and can be worthily received by those only who have proved themselves.[49] The breaking of the bread and the blessing of the chalice is also a sacrifice; for the Christians have an altar whereof those may not eat who serve idols.[50]

The ordination of bishops and presbyters constitutes a special religious rite, which consists in the imposition of hands by the presbyterium or by the Apostles, and imparts grace for the discharge of the various functions of the sacred ministry.[51]

[40] Ibid. 4, 15, 16.
[41] I Tim. 3, 15.
[42] I Cor. 12, 13.
[43] Ibid. 12, 5–30.
[44] Phil. 1, 1; Acts, 19, 6. In regard to St. Paul's teaching on the hierarchy, cfr. F. Prat. La Théologie de Saint Paul, I, 475–482; also Note Y, 488 sqq.
[45] Tit. 1, 9; I Tim. 5, 17.
[46] Tit. 1, 5; I Tim. 4, 13, 14.
[47] Rom. 6, 3–11; Ephes. 2, 5, 6.
[48] Acts, 19, 16.
[49] I Cor. 11, 20–34.
[50] Ibid. 10, 16–21.
[51] I Tim. 4, 14.

Christian marriage is represented as being of a sacred character. The union of husband and wife is a symbol of the union of Christ with His Church. In this sense it is a great sacrament.[52] Such a marriage cannot be dissolved except by death: this is the Lord's command.[53] Although matrimony is thus a holy state, yet perfect continence and virginity are preferable to it; and so is widowhood; but neither of them is obligatory.[54]

In their daily life and in their relation to one another, the members of the Church must walk as the children of light, giving thanks always for all things, and being subject to one another in the fear of Christ. Women must be subject to their husbands, as to the Lord; children must obey their parents in the Lord; servants must yield obedience to their masters from the heart; masters must treat their servants as children of the same Heavenly Father.[55]

The Church is the kingdom of God on earth, and this kingdom shall have its completion in the second coming of Christ. When that will be no one knows, but the time is short; we must use the world as if we used it not, for its figure passes away.[56] However, before the second advent of Christ, the man of sin, the son of perdition, shall appear, who will try to usurp the place of God.[57] Then, at the appointed time, the Lord shall come down from heaven, and at the voice of the Archangel and at the sound of the trumpet, Antichrist shall be exterminated, and the dead shall rise again, some in glory and others in corruption. Thereupon follows the judgment, which shall be presided over by Jesus Christ. Every one shall be judged according to his works.[58] The just shall inherit the kingdom of the Father, which will be at the same time an inheritance and a reward; whilst the wicked receive wrath and sorrow, death and destruction, as the just retribution of their iniquity.[59] They shall be assailed by the Lord

[52] Ephes. 5, 25–32.
[53] I Cor. 7, 10, 11.
[54] Ibid. 7, 7, 25–40.
[55] Ephes. 5, 18–21; 6, 24.
[56] I Cor. 7, 29–31.
[57] II Thes. 2, 3–12.
[58] I Thes. 4, 15; 1, 10; II Thes. 2, 8; Rom. 2, 5–16.
[59] Rom. 8, 17; 2, 5–9; 6, 21.

and His power with an avenging fire. Their torments, as well as the happiness of the just, shall be everlasting.[60]

D— The Blessed Trinity and the Person of Christ

In the Synoptic Gospels only one explicit reference to the Blessed Trinity is recorded as made by Christ, and this is contained in His commandment to baptize in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.[61] However, the divinity of the Son is taught in other texts, as will be shown below; and that of the Holy Ghost seems clearly implied in the passages where He is spoken of as being sinned against and as inspiring the disciples.[62] Hence, as the oneness of God is assumed all through the Gospels and even explicitly stated, the elements of the mystery are found in the Synoptists independently of the baptismal formula.

St. John, on the other hand, is quite clear on the point, although he does not formulate the doctrine in express terms. Christ is the only-begotten of the Father; the Father is the source of the Son's being and action, the Father and the Son know one another; they remain one in the other, to both the same honor is paid, and they are one.[63] In this there is at the same time distinction and identity: distinction of persons and identity of nature. The same position is assigned to the Holy Ghost. He proceeds from the Father and receives from the Son, and this because everything that is the Father's is the Son's also. Both send Him, yet He is not separated from them; for the Father and the Son accompany Him and dwell together with Him in the hearts of the faithful.[64] He is truly a divine person; for He is the Spirit of Truth, who instructs the Apostles, and takes Christ's place in their regard.[65]

St. Paul does not state the mystery of the Blessed Trinity in so many words, but he implies it with sufficient clearness. There is one God, the Father of all, and with Him associated in power and glory is His own Son, who is His image, being

[60] I Cor. 9, 25; Rom. 2, 7; 5, 21; II Thes. 1, 8, 9.
[61] Matt. 28, 19.
[62] Mark, 13, 11; Luke, 10, 10, 12.
[63] John, 5, 19, 26; 10, 15; 8, 29; 5, 23; 10, 30.
[64] Ibid. 15, 26, 14, 15; 16, 26; 14, 23.
[65] Ibid. 14, 16, 17; 15, 26.

in the form of God, and by whom all things are made.[66] With the Father and the Son is enumerated also the Holy Spirit, who dwells in our souls, and who prays in us. He knows the secrets of God, and is God. He is at the same time the Spirit of God and the Spirit of Christ; is sent by the Father and belongs to the Son.[67] Hence the Trinitarian formula: "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the charity of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit be with you all.[68]

Regarding the person of Christ two points are of special importance in this connection: His Messiahship and His divinity. The Synoptists emphasize the first and imply the second; St. John emphasizes the second and clearly states the first; whilst St. Paul brings out both points, though more or less incidentally, representing Christ primarily as the world's Redeemer, who restored man to the high estate from which he had fallen through sin.

As recorded by the Synoptists, Christ presented Himself from the very opening of His public career as the Messias foretold by the Prophets; but at first He did so guardedly, forbidding all open proclamation of the fact.[69] Later on He freely accepted and also openly claimed the title, telling the disciples of the Baptist that in Him were fulfilled the predictions of the Prophets, as the signs and wonders which He wrought abundantly proved.[70] Then He pointed out to His Apostles that one of them would betray Him, that He should be delivered into the hands of the Gentiles, be put to death, but that on the third day He would rise again, as had been foretold in the Old Testament.[71] Thus whatever befalls Him, whatever He says and does, is in fulfilment of the Prophets. His mission is to save what has perished, to give His life as a ransom for many. His blood is the blood of the New Covenant, shed for many unto the remission of sins.[72]

[66] Rom. 8, 32; Col. 1, 15–17; Phil. 2, 6.
[67] I. Cor. 3, 16; 6, 19; Rom. 8, 11; 4, 6.
[68] II Cor. 13, 13.
[69] Luke, 4, 16–21; Mark, 11, 10.
[70] Matt. 11, 3–5.
[71] Mark, 8, 31.
[72] Luke, 24, 44–47; Matt. 26, 28.

As Christ thus claimed to be the Messias, so did He also claim to be the Son of God. It is true, in the Synoptic Gospels He is nowhere recorded as assuming the full title of His own initiative; but it is stated that He freely accepted it from others.[73] Twice, moreover, He styles Himself the Son, and He invariably calls God His Father.[74] That this title was, in the mind of Jesus, not merely Messianic, but implied over and above a divine filiation in the natural sense of the term, is indeed nowhere stated in so many words; but that this was really the case appears to a certainty from His manner of speaking and from the claims which He persistently advanced. A few examples will suffice to make clear the truth of this statement.

Thus almost at the beginning of His public career, in the Sermon on the Mount, He acts as an independent lawgiver, whose authority is equal to that of Jahve.[75] Later on He places Himself far above all Patriarchs and Prophets and holy men of old; they are merely Jahve's servants, whilst He is His Son and heir.[76] He claims a higher origin than that implied in His descent from David, a greater glory than that of the Temple.[77] He is Lord of the Sabbath, and He puts Himself in the very place of Jahve as the spouse of men's immortal souls.[78] He gives the keys of the kingdom of heaven to whom He pleases,[79] and points to Himself as the object of men's highest aspirations, in whom alone they can find rest for their souls.[80] He is the Absolute and Supreme Good, for whose sake men must sacrifice all that is nearest and dearest to them.[81] He is the Supreme Judge, who will pass sentence on all in accordance with what they have done or failed to do to Himself.[82] In speaking of God as His Father, He entirely separates Himself from His disciples and from the rest of mankind: He says, "My Father and your Father," but never, "Our Father." No one knows the Son except the Father,

[73] Matt. 16, 16, 17; Mark, 14, 61, 62.
[74] Matt. 11, 27; Mark, 13, 32.
[75] Matt. 5, 21–48.
[76] Ibid. 21, 33–39.
[77] Ibid. 12, 6.
[78] Ibid. 12, 8; Mark, 2, 18.
[79] Matt. 16, 19; 18, 18.
[80] Ibid. 11, 28, 29.
[81] Ibid. 10, 32–38.
[82] Ibid. 25, 31–46.

and no one knows the Father except the Son: their knowledge is one, and so is their nature.[83] All this, as seems quite obvious, admits of only one reasonable interpretation—that Christ claimed to be true God and wished to be accepted as such by men.

In the Gospel of St. John Christ's claim of the Messiahship appears throughout identified with His statement that He is the Son of God, sent into this world "that whosoever believeth in him may not perish, but have life everlasting." He is first and foremost a divine Messias, who was in the beginning with God as the eternal Word, but in time was made flesh and dwelt amongst us.[84] Before Abraham was HE IS; He was in glory with the Father before the world was made.[85] He comes from heaven and goes back to heaven; yet the Father is greater than He.[86] He is sent into the world, there to fulfill His mission; but also to speak, to act, and to judge in His own name.[87] His mission is that of the Good Shepherd, who lays down His life for His sheep.[88]

St. Paul, as already stated, represents Christ primarily as the promised Redeemer, who delivers the world from sin. Through Adam all have been constituted sinners, through Christ all are made just.[89] With Him comes the liberation from the Law; He is the promise that gladdened the hearts of the fathers. He is of our race and blood, true man, made of woman, of the fathers according to the flesh;[90] like us in all things, sin alone excepted, subject to our infirmities, and therefore capable of compassion in our regard.[91] Nor is He simply an individual man; He is the representative of our race in reference to the redemption. He is the second Adam, who is from heaven heavenly, whilst the first Adam was of the earth earthy; and through Him we all shall become heavenly.[92]

But further, this Christ is more than man: He existed before He appeared on earth, and took part in the creation of the

[83] Ibid. 11, 27; Luke, 10, 22.
[84] John, 1, 1, 14.
[85] Ibid. 8, 58; 17, 5.
[86] Ibid. 6, 63, 33, 51; 14, 28.
[87] Ibid. 8, 26; 10, 32, 37.
[88] Ibid. 10, 17, 18.
[89] Rom. 5, 12-21.
[90] Ibid. 5, 12–19.
[91] Hebr. 2, 17; 4, 15; 7, 26.
[92] I Cor. 15, 45–49.

world. He is the Son of God, God's own proper Son, the first-born, the heir of all things, superior to the angels, who must adore Him. He is the brightness of the Father's glory, the figure of His substance, without beginning and without end of days.[93] Before His coming He existed *in forma Dei*, so that He needed not jealously guard His equality with God, as if He had obtained it by robbery; it was His by nature, since He is over all things God blessed forever.[94]

As the representative of the human race, Christ is made sin for our sake that in Him we may become the justice of God.[95] He is the price of our ransom, the means of propitiation, in which we have a share since we are included in Him.[96] Yet this reconciliation is entirely gratuitous on the part of God, in as much as Jesus is a gratuitous gift to our race, and in Jesus God is reconciling the world to Himself.[97]

This work of restoration culminates in the death of Jesus: sin is crucified in Him, and therefore also in us who are included in Him. He is thus our true High Priest, who offers Himself as a victim for our redemption. His death is a most efficacious sacrifice, which needs to be offered but once.[98] It cleanses not from legal impurities only, as did the sacrifices of the Old Law, but from sin and guilt. It frees us from the dominion of Satan, gives us access to the throne of mercy, and bestows upon us the blessing of divine grace.[99] It is offered for all men, extends to all times, and is perpetuated in heaven, where Jesus intercedes for us.[100] In Christ and in His death, the Levitical priesthood and sacrifices have come to an end.

Further still, Christ not only died for us, but He also rose from the dead and with Him we arise to a new life. This new life has its inception in baptism; then it works through faith, which makes us sharers in His justice and merits.[101] Faith is the substance of things to be hoped for, the evidence

[93] Rom. 8, 32; Col. 1, 15, 17; Hebr. 1, 1-12; 3, 6; 7, 3, 8, 16, 18.
[94] Phil. 2, 6–9; Rom. 9, 5.
[95] Rom. 3, 25; 6, 6; I Cor. 5, 19.
[96] Ibid.
[97] Rom. 5, 8; Ephes. 1, 3–6; II Cor. 5, 19.
[98] Rom. 3, 25; Hebr. 10, 7–10; 7, 27; 9, 12, 15.
[99] Ibid. 10, 9; 4, 6.
[100] Ibid. 2, 9; 9, 25, 26; 9, 11, 12.
[101] Rom. 6, 3–8; 3, 22–25.

of things that appear not. Without faith it is impossible to please God and be saved. Those who lose it have no further hope, as they have no further sacrifice of reconciliation.[102] This faith, however, is not merely speculative; it is eminently practical, a complete surrender of man to God. It is, therefore, not opposed to works in general, but only to those works from which faith is absent. "My just man liveth by faith." [103]

Finally, as the transgression of the first Adam implanted in our flesh the principle of sin, so the restoration wrought by the second Adam implants in our soul the principle of sanctification. This principle is the Spirit of God and of Christ.[104] He is the Spirit of grace and of charisms. By grace we are made intrinsically just before God.[105] Grace is also a principle of action, by which we overcome temptation, do God's work, and merit the crown of eternal justice.[106] Besides, this Spirit of God and of Christ, though dwelling and working chiefly in the soul, to which He renders the testimony of divine sonship, extends His influence also to the body; He consecrates it as His temple, and will one day raise it from the grave.[107]

As the reader may have noticed, on several points of doctrine St. Paul goes considerably beyond the explicit teaching of Jesus as recorded in the Gospels. This seems especially true in regard to the consequences of Adam's fall, the rise and power of concupiscence, the transmission of original sin, the nature of the atonement, the regeneration of human nature, the scope and operation of grace; although these points have barely been touched upon in the above summary of his teaching on redemption. It must be noted, however, that in all this there is nothing really new. What the Gospels imply, he frequently brings out with great clearness, as was required by the conditions and circumstances under which he wrote and

[102] Hebr. 11, 1, 6; 6, 4–8.
[103] Rom. 1, 5, 17; 6, 16, 17; G. 2, 16; 3, 11.
[104] Rom. 8, 4–12; I Cor. 2, 14, 15; G. 5, 16.
[105] Rom. 5, 16–21; Ephes. 3, 14, 21.
[106] Rom. 7, 23–25; I Cor. 15, 10; II Tim. 4, 7, 8.
[107] I Cor. 3, 16; 6, 19; Rom. 8, 11.

preached. His initial declaration that his preaching was "by the revelation of Christ," and that he had not received his message from men, was not meant as a justification of any departure in his doctrine from the Gospel message announced by the other Apostles. Hence his boldness in declaring anathema any one who should presume to preach a gospel different from his own. Hence, too, the readiness with which James and Cephas and John gave him the right hand of fellowship.[108]

[108] G. 1, 9.

CHAPTER IV

CHRISTIAN LIFE IN APOSTOLIC TIMES: THE FIRST APPEARANCE OF HERESIES

Faithful to their Master's command, the Apostles waited for " the power of the Holy Ghost " and then " were witnesses unto Jesus in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and Samaria, and even to the uttermost part of the earth." Assisted by the Holy Spirit, they taught whatever He had commanded them, and thus spread the glad tidings of salvation through the name of Jesus. Their earliest missionary preaching developed this thesis: Jesus is the promised Messias; in Him all the prophecies are fulfilled; He died for the salvation of sinners, was buried, rose again from the dead, ascended into heaven, and on the last day He shall come to judge all mankind. He is the Ruler and the Lord: Him all must accept, believe in, and worship. All must do penance, be baptized in the name of Jesus for the remission of sins, and then they shall receive the Holy Ghost.[1]

These glad tidings were first announced to the Jews, but by a special revelation Peter was reminded that they must also be preached to the Gentiles.[2] As head of the Church, he acted independently in the matter, but not without being severely criticised by certain narrow-minded converts from Judaism.[3] Later on it was especially St. Paul who devoted himself to the conversion of Gentile nations. Concerning the conditions on which converts from heathenism were to be admitted, there was at first a diversity of opinion, but a council of the Apostles and elders decided that the ordinances of the Mosaic Law need not be observed.[4] However, a Judaizing party caused

[1] Cfr. Acts, cc. 1–5.
[2] Ibid. c. 10.
[3] Ibid. 11, 1–3.
[4] Ibid. 15, 1–29.

considerable trouble, and it was largely due to the determination of St. Paul that the decisions given at Jerusalem were carried into effect.

The gradual formation of the Church and the development of the hierarchy proceeded in conformity with the fundamental ideas outlined in the preceding chapter. Admittance into the Church could be obtained only through baptism, and this presupposed faith and penance.[5] Baptism was followed by imposition of hands, whereby the Holy Ghost was communicated.[6] The faithful persevered in prayer and in the breaking of bread.[7] In Jerusalem they at first practiced community of goods, and in all places they were mindful of the poorer brethren. For the service of the poor seven deacons were chosen by the faithful, and then consecrated for their work by the Apostles.[8] Some of them also preached the Gospel and baptized converts; but they could not communicate the Holy Spirit by the imposition of hands. This was reserved to the Apostles.[9] If any of the faithful fell sick, the presbyters were called in, to pray over the sick man and to anoint him with oil in the name of Jesus, that he might obtain relief in his sickness and also the forgiveness of his sins.[10] For the continuance of the Apostolic work, men of approved virtue were constituted presbyters by the imposition of hands, and thereby the Holy Ghost made them guardians of the flock.[11]

As regards the instruction of converts before baptism, the Acts of the Apostles and the Letters of St. Paul make it sufficiently clear that this was in the beginning of a somewhat compendious and general character. Thus, when it is stated that after the first sermon of St. Peter "as many as received the word were baptized," and "there were added in that day about three thousand souls," [12] the inference is that faith in the most fundamental doctrines of the religion of Jesus and a ready will to observe His commandments were then and

[5] Ibid. 2, 38, 41; 8, 36–28.
[6] Ibid. 8, 17, 19; 19, 5, 6.
[7] Ibid. 2, 42, 46; 20, 11.
[8] Ibid. 6, 1–6.
[9] Ibid. 8, 14.
[10] Jas. 5, 14, 15.
[11] Acts, 20, 28.
[12] Acts, 1, 41.

there deemed sufficient for admission into the Church. Yet from this it does not follow that the first Christians had only a vague and imperfect idea of the contents of their faith. For it must be remembered that the whole Gospel was preached to them, and however limited their knowledge of Christian truths might be at the time of their baptism, it was certainly very much extended and perfected as soon as the opportunity for this was offered. In fact, it was precisely from the preaching of the Apostles that our present Gospels originated, and therefore their contents must have been known to the Christians of the Apostolic age. Faith and good will were in the earliest times undoubtedly considered sufficient for baptism, but baptism was only the beginning of Christian life.

Nor must it be forgotten that these first converts came from Judaism, and were already instructed in nearly all the essentials of the faith. Their acceptance of the Messias, as preached by the Apostles, made their faith Christian. No doubt, occasionally pagans also were received in the same way, but as a general rule their instruction previous to baptism was more thorough. St. Paul's practice of tarrying for a considerable time in each new church he founded, as well as his letters to the different Christian communities, bears ample witness to this. Along what lines these instructions proceeded, may, aside from the Letters themselves, be gathered from the Apostles' Creed, which we know to have been used at the beginning of the second century as a profession of faith before baptism. It is indeed not certain that this Creed was composed by the Apostles themselves, although there was an early tradition to that effect; nevertheless, as the most competent critics admit, it certainly grew out of an Apostolic practice. In its most ancient form it reads as follows:

"I believe in one God, the Father Almighty; and in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Saviour, born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary, crucified under Pontius Pilate, and buried, He rose again on the third day from the dead, ascended into heaven, sitteth at the right hand of the Father; from whence He shall come to judge the living and the dead; and

in the Holy Ghost, the Holy Church, the forgiveness of sins, and the resurrection of the body." [13].

As is quite obvious, this Creed is divided into three articles, which correspond to the three divine names in the baptismal formula. The first article contains a statement of the candidate's belief in one God, the author of all things; the second epitomizes the whole Gospel history; whilst the third, professing faith in the Holy Ghost, is completed by a brief mention of the Church, the forgiveness of sins through baptism, and the resurrection of the body. Used as a profession of faith in the baptismal rite, it served at the same time as a recapitulation of the catechetical instructions which had been given to the neophytes. Hence it gives us a fair insight into the general scope and contents of these instructions.

With this general outline of Apostolic teaching before us, and calling to mind what was said in the first and second chapters about the condition of the Jewish and Gentile world at the time of Christ, we can form some idea of what conversion to Christianity meant in those early days. For converts from paganism there was opened up an entirely new world. The gods and goddesses of their erstwhile Pantheon were forever dethroned, making way for the one true God, who was to be adored in spirit and in truth. There were to be no further incantations, divinations, and offerings of material victims in sacrifice; but in their stead succeeded hymns and canticles, and the one clean oblation once offered for the redemption of the world. The attainment of riches and the enjoyment of pleasures were no longer to constitute life's chief purpose; for the world and all its passing show were to be regarded as a place and condition of exile, whose one object must ever be to make preparation for the coming of the Lord. Truly a star had risen out of Jacob, whose radiance enlightened the dwellers in the shadows of the valley of death.

But even for converts from Judaism there was opened up a much wider horizon than they had ever dreamt of whilst still groaning under the yoke of the Law. They still retained

[13] Cfr. Bardenhewer, Altkirch. Lit. I, 68-76; Patrol. 17, 18; Tixeront, H. D. I, 142.

their ancient watchword, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is one God," but with this one God was associated in their new belief His only-begotten Son, who dwelt on the very pinnacle of divinity. There could be no thought in their mind that He was divine in a wider sense, as were the deified heroes of Greece and Rome; or that His generation from the Father was on a par with that of the old gods of Olympus whose genealogies were well known. Whether their instructions had been received from James or John or Peter, it mattered not: Jesus Christ was put before them as God's own Son, the eternal Word, true God, by whom all things were made. And then there was the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of the Father and of the Son, the Spirit of God and of Christ, in whose name, together with that of the Father and of the Son, they had received the remission of their sins in the sacred laver of regeneration. He, too, must be reverenced with equal honor. Yes, O Israel, the Lord thy God is one God, but in that one God is the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost, each of them identical with God and yet in some mysterious way each one distinct from the others. In this was presented to them a mystery of the inner life of the Godhead which perhaps even those among them who were most conversant with Jewish theology had barely so much as suspected.

And so were their minds raised to loftier heights in the worship which this Triune God claimed as acceptable to Him from His children on earth. The Temple worship with its multifarious sacrifices of sheep and goats and oxen, and its many sprinklings of blood, was set aside as superseded by the one great sacrifice of the New Covenant, wherein they were nourished with the body and blood of their God Redeemer. Only in the accidental accompaniment of prayers and hymns, of reading and exhortation, did they find themselves in an atmosphere they were familiar with from their recollection of the Synagogue. Even through this there breathed a different spirit, less narrow, less subservient to the letter of the sacred text, but the material part was practically the same. Their own holy Patriarchs were placed before them as examples of Christian virtue, their own beautiful Psalms were recited as

Christian prayers. This was a precious heirloom which preserved to them their glorious past, and, in the comments that followed, this past was dwelt upon in order to direct their hopes to a still more glorious future. Then, too, the monotony of their work-a-day life was as heretofore relieved by the Sabbath rest, although at an early date the following day, or Sunday, seems to have been devoted to divine service. In all this they had a decided advantage over their fellow converts from paganism, whose whole religious life had to be placed on a new basis.

A further widening of outlook was experienced by converts from Judaism in reference to their social relations. Hitherto, even if domiciled in Gentile lands, their social intercourse was practically limited to those of their own nation. They were the chosen people, and intimate contact with strangers begot in them a certain sense of defilement, even apart from the prescriptions and prohibitions of the Law. Hence wherever they finally settled down in their wanderings over the Empire, they forthwith formed a community within a community, governed by its own customs and largely also by its own laws. But now they were taught that in Christ Jesus there was neither Jew nor Gentile, neither bond nor free, and that even strangers must be loved and treated as children of the same Father in heaven. However, this did not cause so violent a wrench as might at first sight appear; for the idea of a chosen people was instinctively transferred from the Jewish nation to the followers of Christ, whom St. Peter had already designated as "a chosen generation, a kingly priesthood, a holy nation, a purchased people." Hence, although there was some opposition in the Palestinian community, there soon sprang up a new Israel, whose children, gathered from all parts of the Empire, were quickened by the same faith, sustained by the same hope, bound together by the same charity, and guided in their aspirations and practices by the universally acknowledged authority of those whom Christ had sent to announce the glad tidings of salvation. It was the Infant Church, which had made its advent in the silence of the night.

On the other hand, much greater difficulties were experi-

enced by converts from paganism in readjusting their social relations. For them to become Christians was, in this respect, a most momentous step. It practically meant entire separation from ordinary life. For pagan society was so permeated by superstition, immorality, and idolatrous practices, that neither theaters, nor public games, nor ordinary social functions could in conscience be frequented by one who professed to be a follower of Christ. These, in fact, constituted the works of Satan and his pomps, which every one was called upon to renounce on being received into the Church. In many instances this would mean disruption of life long friendships, breaking up of the home, and exclusion from the common civilities of life. In time, too, it would lead to difficulties with the State; for although the Jews, because of their acknowledged national privileges, were allowed to limit their religious practices to the worship of Jahve, such a favor was not granted to Christian converts from paganism. In the matter of worship pagan gods had always been extremely accommodating; and hence, whatever might be their name or position, their clients were called upon, at least occasionally, to take part in the various functions of the State religion. What this view of the matter, when practically enforced, meant to the Christians, later persecutions will amply show.

Such, then, was the life of those who received the word, and who tried in the simplicity of their hearts to become other Christs. But there were many others who heard the word but received it not; to whom the Saviour referred when He said: "The kingdom of heaven is likened to a man that sowed good seed in his field. But while men were asleep, his enemy came and over-sowed cockle among the wheat, and went his way. And when the blade was sprung up, and had brought forth fruit, then appeared also the cockle." [14] How truly prophetic this parable of our Blessed Saviour must appear to one who studies the spread of the Gospel! The message contained therein was indeed good seed; it was sown diligently in the field of the world; it sprang up and brought forth excellent

[14] Matt. 13, 26.

fruit: but mixed up with it appeared from the very first much cockle—doctrines of men's making, false philosophical speculations, "fables and genealogies without end, which minister questions rather than the edification of God which is in faith." The saying of St. Paul, that heresies must needs be,[15] was fully verified during his own life time and that of the other Apostles. It is in these heretical vagaries that Hellenic speculations and Oriental mysticism have left their traces, rather than in the genesis of Christian thought and in the development of Christian doctrines. A brief summary of them, as they appeared in Apostolic times, will be helpful in clearing up the movements of orthodox thought.

These early aberrations seem to have sprung from two opposite tendencies; one of which was to perpetuate the observance of the Mosaic Law in the New Covenant, the other to force the Gospel contents into ready-made systems of philosophy, partly Greek and partly Oriental in character. The former tendency gave rise to Judaic-Christianity, the latter to Gnosticism. Of Judaic-Christianity, however, it is not necessary to treat in this connection, since, as an active force, it was short-lived and caused no real doctrinal disturbances. Its first advocates were substantially orthodox in faith, and when later on heretical elements found their way into its teaching, the party exercised only an insignificant local influence. Cerinthus indeed, who denied the divinity of Christ, and to refute whom St. John is said to have written his Gospel, drew after him a certain following, but his influence appears to have been transient. The last remnants of this heterodox Judaic-Christianity are found among the Ebionites and Nazarenes, who in the second and third centuries led an inactive existence in Syria and Palestine, and then disappeared from history.

Gnosticism, on the other hand, which appeared only in germ during Apostolic times, played subsequently a rather important part in doctrinal development. It seems to have first made its appearance under a Judaizing guise, and as such

[15] I Cor. 11, 19.

reference is made to it in St. Paul's Epistle to the Colossians, in the Pastoral Epistles, in the second Epistle of St. Peter and that of St. Jude, and also in the Epistles and Apocalypse of St. John. Somewhat later it is again referred to in the Letters of St. Ignatius and St. Polycarp.

In his Epistle to the Colossians, St. Paul first draws a magnificent portrait of Christ the Redeemer, the Son of God, "in whom we have redemption through his blood, the remission of sins: who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature: for in him were all things created in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones, or dominations, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him and in him: and he is before all, and by him all things consist." Then he adds: "Now this I say, that no man may deceive you by loftiness of words." What he understood by this "loftiness of words," he explains by his further warnings: "Beware lest any man cheat you by philosophy, and vain deceit; according to the tradition of men, according to the elements of the world, and not according to Christ." "Let no man therefore judge you in meat or drink, or in respect of festival days, or of the new moon, or of the sabbaths, which are a shadow of the things to come, but the body is Christ's. Let no man seduce you, willing in humility, and religion of angels, walking in the things which he hath not seen, in vain puffed up by the sense of his flesh, and not holding the head, from which the whole body, by joints and bands being supplied with nourishment and compacted, groweth unto the increase of God. If then you be dead with Christ from the elements of this world; why do you yet decree as living in the world? Touch not, taste not, handle not: which all are unto destruction by the very use, according to the precepts and doctrines of men. Which things have indeed a show of wisdom in superstition and humility, and not sparing the body, not in any honor to the filling of the flesh." [16]

From this it appears that there were various tendencies at work to depreciate the person of Christ, to set aside the re-

[16] Cfr. Col. cc. 1, 2.

demption which He wrought, and to cause disunion in the Church. The angels seem to have been placed above Jesus; salvation was made dependent on various unseemly practices, in one way or another tending to an abuse of the body; and the purity of Christian worship was more or less destroyed by the observance of feasts, new moons, and sabbaths. No definite doctrinal system is indicated as the source of these heterodox practices, yet in the light of later developments one can readily detect in them the beginnings of the second-century Gnostic heresies.

In his Pastoral Letters the Apostle is even more severe in condemning these disturbers of the Christian communities. He points to Hymenæus, Philetus, and Alexander the coppersmith, as drawing after them men of "itching ears," and especially women, upsetting their minds with questions as silly as they are subtle, and disseminating Jewish fables. They inculcate abstinence from marriage and from certain kinds of food, and teach that there is no other resurrection than that from sin. Morally these men are utterly corrupt, seeking only for gain. "They profess that they know God, but in their hearts they deny Him, being abominable, and incredulous, and to every good work reprobate." [17]

Those referred to in the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude seem to have been of the same kind: for they "deny our only Master and Lord Jesus Christ," despise authority and reject the doctrine of the judgment and the Lord's coming. Their morals are infamous: they blaspheme what they do not understand, and are beastly in their conduct.[18]

St. John, when speaking of these or similar heretics, characterizes their doctrine as "the depth of Satan." They claim to be apostles and Jews, but they are of the synagogue of the devil. They teach chiefly unchastity, and the lawfulness of eating meats offered to idols.[19] In his First Epistle he says there are many antichrists, who have come from the ranks of Christians. They deny that Jesus is the Christ and the Son. They are liars: and by denying the Son, they have not the

[17] I Tim. 1, 20; 6, 5–10; II Tim. 2, 17, 18; 4, 6; Tit. 1, 11, 15, 16.

[18] Jude, 4, 8, 10; II Pet. 2, 3–14.

[19] Apoc. 2, 9, 14–25; 3, 9.

Father. "Every spirit which confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is of God: and every spirit that dissolveth Jesus, is not of God: and this is the Antichrist." [20]

In what sense precisely these false teachers denied that "Jesus is the Christ and the Son," and that "Jesus Christ is come in the flesh," is not clear; but the most probable inference is that they regarded Him as purely human, and thereby denied the doctrine of the Incarnation. How these first attempts of turning Christian thought into heterodox channels, and incidentally also of corrupting the purity of Christian morals, gradually developed into full-fledged Gnosticism, we shall have occasion to point out when studying the doctrinal development that was going on during the second century. Here are the germs.

[20] I John, 2, 18–23; 4, 2, 3, 15.

CHAPTER V

THE WRITINGS AND TEACHING OF THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS[1]

By Apostolic Fathers, in this connection, are understood the authors of certain early Christian writings, generally orthodox in tone and teaching but not inspired, which were produced in Apostolic or sub-Apostolic times, ranging, roughly speaking, from the last decade of the first to the middle of the second century. The writings in question are nine in number, but the authors of only five of them are known. These are: St. Clement of Rome, St. Ignatius of Antioch, St. Polycarp of Smyrna, St. Papias of Hierapolis in Phrygia, and Hermas the brother of Pope Pius I. For the sake of clearness it seems advisable to divide our review of these rather important documents into two sections. In the first we shall give some general information regarding each document, together with a brief analysis of its contents; and in the second we shall group the dogmatic teaching of the several authors under a number of conventional headings, corresponding more or less to the treatises usually studied in our modern schools of theology.

A—The Writings of the Apostolic Fathers

Geographically and chronologically the writings of the Apostolic Fathers may be arranged in the following order, although some authors prefer a different arrangement:

1°. *The Didache; or, the Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles.*—According to Bardenhewer, Funk, Zahn, Sabatier, and the majority of critics, this little treatise appeared in the last

[1] Cfr. Bardenhewer, Patrology, 19–43, English Translation by Thos. J. Shahan; Geschichte der Altkirchlichen Litteratur, I, 76–146; F. X. Funk, Patres Apostolici; Tixeront, History of Dogmas, I, 104. Batiffol, Primitive Catholicism; * Durell, The Historic Church, 11–128.

decade of the first century, most likely in Palestine or Syria. It is now usually regarded as authentic, with the exception of two verses (1, 3; 2,1), which, however, have no direct dogmatic value. It seems to have been intended as a catechetical instruction, the contents of which are gathered around three main points: Moral Conduct, Church Discipline, and Eschatology.

The part dealing with moral conduct (1-6) begins with the sentence: "There are two ways, the way of life and the way of death, but there is a great difference between the two." Then it is pointed out what must be done to remain in the way of life, which is practically a development of the general proposition announced in the second sentence: "This is the way of life: First, love God, who created thee; then, love thy neighbor as thyself: and whatever you do not wish that it should be done to you, neither do it to another." The exposition and practical application of this general law of Christian conduct takes up the first four chapters. In the following two, 5 and 6, the way of death is described. This is chiefly done by pointing out the various crimes against the Decalogue, and in particular those referred to by St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans. The author ends with a warning against false teachers and the eating of meats that have been sacrificed to idols.

The second part, dealing with Church discipline, begins with directions in reference to the administration of baptism, for which the Trinitarian formula is prescribed. Ordinary Christian practices are touched upon in chapter 8, where the faithful are told to fast on Wednesdays and Fridays, and to recite the Lord's Prayer three times a day. Chapters 9 and 10 give the prayers to be said at the agape, during which, according to the more common interpretation, bread and wine were consecrated and distributed to the faithful. The same matter is again taken up in chapter 14, where it is enjoined to celebrate the divine mysteries on Sundays. In connection with this, the following chapter (15) contains directions for the appointment of bishops and deacons, whose office it is to offer the Christian sacrifice and to instruct the faithful. Apostles,

prophets, and teachers are also mentioned, and rules are given to distinguish the true from the false.

The third part, which takes up the last chapter, treats almost exclusively of eschatological topics. The faithful are exhorted to come frequently together, in order to take counsel concerning their spiritual welfare and protect themselves against false prophets, of whom there will appear many in the last days.

2°. *The Epistle of Barnabas; or, The Pseudo-Barnabas.*— The time of its composition is not certain. Bardenhewer, Funk, Hilgenfeld, Weiszaecker, Cunningham, Lightfoot, and many others, assign as its latest possible date the close of the first century, immediately after the reign of Nerva (96-98). Harnack is non-committal. The home of the author, according to the more common view, was Alexandria in Egypt. Some few scholars still defend this so-called Epistle as the work of Barnabas the Apostle, but their view seems to be untenable.

Aside from the introduction, the work is divided into two very unequal parts; the first comprising seventeen chapters and the second four. In the first part a decided antagonism is shown to the Old Testament, especially in its literal interpretation as understood by the Jews. So interpreted the author regards it as the work of the devil. Hence his purpose is to draw Christian believers away from it, and thus to perfect them in the true knowledge of the faith as derived from the more spiritual preaching of the Apostles. His own interpretation of the Old Testament is consistently allegorical, assigning throughout an exclusively spiritual meaning to the various ordinances and enactments of the Mosaic Law. The second part is little more than an adaptation of the Two Ways described in the Didache.

3°. *The Prima Clementis; or, The First Letter of Clement to the Corinthians.*— According to Eusebius (Hist. Eccl. 3, 15, 34), Clement was the third successor of St. Peter, and sat in the pontifical chair from 92 to 101. There is, however, a tradition according to which he followed St. Peter immediately. If this latter view be adopted, the date of the letter

falls somewhere between 67 and 80. In either case it must be regarded as a first century document.

Modern scholars are generally agreed that this letter is a model Pastoral, simple in style, cogent in argument, and full of fatherly solicitude for the welfare of the Church. It consists of an introduction, two main divisions, and a recapitulation. In the introduction the author first expresses his regret that the late persecution prevented him from writing sooner, and then depicts in an eloquent manner the former prosperous condition of the Corinthian church and its present miserable state (1-3). In the first part (4-36) he lays down general principles, gives instructions and admonitions, warns against envy and jealousy, and strongly recommends the practice of humility, obedience, and penance; all of which he enforces by examples taken from the Old Testament. Then, in the second part (37-61), he passes over to the troubles that are disturbing the church at Corinth. Here he treats of the hierarchy, its institution, mode of perpetuation, and authority over the faithful. He emphasizes the necessity of subjection on the part of the people, urges all to practice mutual charity, and calls upon the disturbers to do penance and to submit. In the recapitulation (62-65) he runs over the contents of the letter, recommends his messengers to the good will of the Corinthians, and ends with a beautiful liturgical prayer.

4°. *The Seven Letters of Ignatius of Antioch.*—Addressed respectively, Ad Ephesios, Ad Magnesios, Ad Trallianos, Ad Romanos, Ad Philadelphenses, Ad Smyrnaeos, Ad Polycarpum. St. Ignatius was the second successor of St. Peter in the see of Antioch in Syria. He was martyred in Rome during the reign of Trajan (98-117), but the exact year of his death is not known. He wrote the first four letters at Smyrna and the last three at Troas, whilst on his way to Rome, a captive for the faith.

These letters, whose authenticity is no longer called in question with any show of reason, are justly regarded as the most precious heirloom of Christian antiquity. They are original in thought, powerful in diction, glowing with charity, and crowded with doctrinal instruction. Regarding this last point

Cardinal Newman did not hesitate to say that "the whole system of Catholic doctrine may be discovered, at least in outline, not to say in parts filled up, in the course of these seven epistles." [2] And this is no exaggeration. The sovereignty and majesty of God, the Incarnation and redemption, the visibility, unity, and catholicity of the Church, the real presence of the Saviour in the Eucharist, the various means of sanctification in the Church of Christ, the virtues that must adorn the Christian life, and many other topics are dealt with in the author's own unique way. As Tixeront has well pointed out in his "History of Dogmas," the dogmatic teaching of Ignatius is chiefly gathered around three points: Christ, the Church, Christian Life.[3] Not that there is any attempt to present a carefully thought out theological system, but the needs of the various churches to which the author wrote called for suggestions along these lines.

5°. *The Fragments of the Writings of St. Papias.* — It is commonly held that Papias was in his youth a disciple of St. John the Evangelist. Later on he became bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia. He seems to have died about the year 150, but at what particular date he composed the book of which these few fragments have been preserved is a matter of conjecture. What remains of his writings is of no special dogmatic value, except in so far as it gives us some information regarding the expected Millennium and the origin of the Gospels according to St. Mark and St. Matthew.

6°. *The Letter of St. Polycarp.*—Polycarp also was in his youth a disciple of St. John, and by him was made bishop of Smyrna in Asia Minor. He was martyred in his own episcopal city, February 23, 155, in the eighty-sixth year of his life. The year before his death he had paid a visit to Rome, in order to confer with Pope Anicetus about the time when Easter should be celebrated. They did not come to an understanding on this point, but preserved the harmony of faith and charity. During his stay in Rome, as St. Irenæus relates, he one day met the heretic Marcion, who asked him, do you

[2] Theology of the Seven Epistles of St. Ignatius, Historical Sketches.
[3] H. D. I, 122.

know me? "Surely, I know the first-born of Satan," was Polycarp's forceful reply, thereby indicating his abhorrence of all heresy and schism.

He wrote his letter at the request of the church of Philippi in Macedonia, the presbyters of which had sent him word about Ignatius and in turn begged him for a copy of the martyr's letters, together with a word of advice from himself. This request alone, he states, emboldened him to write to a church that had been founded by the great Apostle Paul, from whom also they had received an Epistle whilst he was laboring in distant parts. Then, after some general remarks, he admonishes and advises the different classes of the faithful; married women and widows, young men and women, deacons and priests. Next he refers to the sad fall of a certain Valens, a presbyter, whom avarice had led into evil ways, and he begs them that by prayer and charity they may endeavor to bring him back to the Church. In conclusion he promises to send the message of the Philippians about Ignatius to Antioch, says that he will forward to them copies of all the letters he has in his possession, and begs for further news about the martyr if perchance they should receive any. Hence the letter must have been written shortly after the martyrdom of Ignatius. Several passages show that the author was familiar with Clement's letter to the Corinthians.

7°. *The Martyrium Polycarpi,* an account of the martyrdom of the saintly bishop of Smyra. Issued by the authorities of that church, it was intended for the different Christian communities in Asia Minor, where Polycarp was held in great veneration. It was written in 155 or 156. The inscription runs thus: "The Church of God which is sojourning at Smyrna to the Church of God that sojourns at Philomelium, and to all the communities of the Holy and Catholic Church in every place." It contains several points of considerable dogmatic value, which will be brought out in the second part of this chapter.

8°. *The Shepherd of Hermas.*—Hermas composed his work at Rome during the Pontificate of his brother, Pius I, who was Pope from 140 to 154. Early writers usually identified

him with Hermas, the disciple of St. Paul, but the Muratorian Fragment determines his date and identity as here given.

This treatise has been aptly called "a vast examination of conscience of the church of Rome," because in it the author lays bare with unsparing hand the many shortcomings, vacillations, and sins of the Roman Christians, both lay and cleric, and proposes the serious practice of penance as the only remedy that can cure these evils. Hence in concept and purpose it is a treatise on penance, although incidentally other matters are also touched upon and explained.

The work is apocalyptic in character, and derives its exhortatory force from the supposed divine inspiration of the author and the command he received from God to set forth the revelations vouchsafed him for the good of the Church. It consists of five Visiones, twelve Mandata, and ten Similitudines. In reference, however, to the contents, the treatise is divided into two parts. The first of these comprises the first four Visiones, in which the Church appears in the form of a matron, giving the author various instructions. The second part is made up of the fifth Visio, in which the Angel of Penance appears under the guise of a shepherd, and entrusts to him a number of mandata to be made known to the Church. It is from this last part that the whole work has received the name of "The Shepherd."

9°. *The Secunda Clementis; or, the Second Letter of Clement to the Corinthians.*— This document was by most ancient writers ascribed to Clement of Rome, but since the discovery of the entire text, or rather its publication in 1875, it has been shown to be a homily, which was produced at Corinth towards the middle of the second century. Who the author was is not known. Its contents are of a somewhat varied character, though the main purpose of the preacher seems to have been to exhort his hearers to the practice of penance.

Taken geographically, these nine documents represent almost the whole Church during the half century to which they belong. Their importance, therefore, in reference to the History of Dogmas is obvious. It must, however, be borne in mind that not one of these writers purposes to give a complete exposition

of Christian doctrine. They touch upon various doctrinal points in a merely casual way, being primarily intent upon exhorting their readers or hearers to the practice of virtue. Hence to infer from their writings that nothing was taught in those days except what they explicitly state, as is frequently done by modern critics, is as foolish as it is unfair.

B — Teaching of the Apostolic Fathers

From what sources the Apostolic Fathers drew the contents of their teaching is sufficiently evident from their own works. They appealed both to Scripture and tradition. Besides the various books of the Old Testament, of which they make frequent use, they also cite, though less frequently, nearly all the writings that are now contained in the New. In these sources they find the word of God, made known to men by the Spirit of Truth. This same Spirit also guides the Church in carrying on her divine mission of teaching all nations, so that her voice is none other than the voice of Christ. Indeed for practical purposes the teaching of the Church is supreme; for it is she who breathes the living spirit into the dead letter of the written word, and thus makes it available for Christ's flock entrusted to her shepherding.

This last thought is especially emphasized by St. Ignatius, whose efforts to ward off heresy and schism compelled him in a manner to set down his views on the matter in question. Thus writing to the church at Philadelphia, he says: "When I heard some of them saying: 'Unless I find it in the archives, that is, in the gospels, I do not believe it,' and I told them that it was so written, they answered: 'This is to be proved.' But to me Jesus Christ is the archive." [4] And again to the church of Ephesus: "Jesus Christ, our inseparable life, is the thought of the Father, as also the bishops, all the world over, are in agreement with the mind of Jesus Christ." [5] And to the church at Smyrna: "Where the bishop shall appear, there let the people also be; as where Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholic Church." [6] Thus presided over by the bishops,

[4] Philad. 8, 2.
[5] Eph. 3, 2.
[6] Smyrn. 8, 2.

the Church is an incorruptible teacher; for Christ has made her incorruptible.[7] Hence "He has set up through His resurrection, in all ages, a standard for the saints and for His followers, whether they be Jews or Gentiles, in the one body of His Church."[8]

In the following brief summary of the teaching of the Apostolic Fathers no attempt will be made to construct anything like a theological system, but it will be very helpful to gather their incidental statements and elucidations of doctrinal points under the same headings that form the main divisions of systematic theology as it is taught in our schools to-day. This will enable us to make some sort of comparison between what is held at present and what we here find to have been held in the distant past. The chief points to be considered are the following:

1°. *God and His Relation to the World.*— All these writers either expressly state or obviously imply that there is only one God, who transcends the world of finite beings, and has nothing in common with the false gods of pagan mythology. He is the creator of all things, the source of all blessings, the one object of all true worship. "First of all believe," says Hermas, "that there is one God, who created and consummated all that is, and out of nothing caused all things to be. He comprehends all, though He Himself is incomprehensible."[9] "Do we not have one God," asks Clement, "and one Christ, and one Spirit of grace poured out upon us, and one calling in Christ?"[10] "This is the way of life," explains the author of the Didache, "first, love God, who created thee."[11] "The Prophets, inspired by the grace of Christ," writes Ignatius, "suffered persecutions for the purpose of convincing the incredulous that there is one God, who manifested Himself through Jesus Christ His Son."[12] "This God," again argues Clement, "has established all things by the word of His majesty and by His word he can destroy them all."[13] Yet

[7] Eph. 17, 1.
[8] Smyrn. 1, 2.
[9] Mandat. 1, 1.
[10] I Clem. 46, 6.
[11] Didache 1, 2.
[12] Magn. 8, 2.
[13] I Clem. 27, 4.

He is not only a God of power, but also of merciful kindness, who is faithful to His promises and ever ready to receive back the erring.[14] It is a thoroughly Christian concept, based upon the teaching of Holy Scripture. So impressed is the author with the greatness and goodness of God, that ever and anon there flows spontaneously from his pen the doxology, "to whom be glory, world without end. Amen."

And what Clement, Hermas, Ignatius, and the author of the Didache thus express in so many words, all the others presuppose or imply as a belief that is held by every true follower of Christ. Hence when Polycarp was already bound to the stake, he ended his long prayer for friend and foe with the sublime words: "Wherefore I praise Thee in all things, I bless Thee, I glorify Thee through the eternal and heavenly high priest Jesus Christ, Thy beloved Son, through whom be glory to Thee together with Him and the Holy Spirit, now and through all future ages. Amen."

This firm and universal belief of these early Christians in the unity and transcendence of God, and in His loving solicitude for the creatures of His hands, is a point that deserves the most careful consideration in the History of Dogmas. Not only is it the foundation upon which Christianity was conceived to rest, but it also holds the key to the expressions used by these same writers in reference to the divinity of Christ and the Holy Spirit. Paganism confounded the deity with the world, and as a result it made gods of its own dead heroes; Christianity, on the other hand, separated God from the world, in the sense that it conceived God's being as standing absolutely by itself, and therefore as absolutely unapproachable by any other being, no matter with what extraordinary perfections it might be endowed. Between God and man these early Christians saw a chasm that nothing could bridge. Men might become godlike, but in no sense could they become gods. It is precisely in this that men like Harnack make a fundamental mistake. Because Christianity was propagated in a pagan world, therefore, they infer, its concept of God must have been more or less like that of paganism.[15] A mere glance

[14] Ibid. 19, 2, 3; 29, 1.
[15] Cfr. Harnack, Dogmengeschichte I, 203, foll.

at these early writers is quite sufficient to convince one of the contrary. They one and all echo the teaching of Holy Writ: "Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is one God!"

2°. *The Divinity of Christ.*—Although God was thus conceived as absolutely one, standing in His essence wholly apart from the world of finite beings, nevertheless the Apostolic Fathers had no hesitancy about admitting Christ also to be God. In regard to this point they do not all speak with the same clearness and precision, still, with the possible exception of Hermas, there is not one among them who gives expression to a different belief. The author of the Didache usually addresses God the Father "per Jesum puerum tuum," through Jesus thy servant, but as this is a liturgical formula, no argument can be drawn from it against his belief in the divinity of the Saviour.[16] Nor, on the other hand, is it a conclusive proof for his belief in the Saviour's divinity when he calls Jesus the "God of David."[17] But when he directs his readers to baptize "in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost,"[18] the presumption is that he looked upon the Son and the Holy Spirit as associated with the Father in the same Godhead. For although this is a Scriptural formula, nevertheless we may well assume that these early Christians understood not less clearly than we do that a mere creature could not be associated with God in the solemn rite of Christian initiation.

Clement also, when using liturgical formulas, speaks of Christ as the servant of God,[19] but in other connections he calls Him God's Son.[20] Again, he associates Him and the Holy Spirit with the Father in the solemn formula of adjuration: "As God liveth, and the Lord Jesus Christ liveth, and the Holy Spirit, the faith and hope of the elect, so shall they who keep the commandments be in the number of those who are saved through Christ."[21] This formula, as Tixeront points out,[22] is equivalent to the Old Testament formula, "as

[16] Cfr. Didache 9, 2, 3.
[17] Ibid. 10, 6.
[18] Ibid. 7, 2.
[19] I Clem. 59, 2, 3, 4.
[20] Ibid. 36, 4.
[21] Ibid. 58, 2.
[22] H. D. I. 108.

the Lord liveth," so that for Clement "the Lord" is identical with "God, the Lord Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit." Moreover Clement applies to the Saviour the very explicit declaration of divinity contained in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, thus incidentally making it quite clear in what sense he understands the term "Son of God." [23]

Polycarp speaks of Jesus Christ as "the Son of God, our eternal pontiff,[24] who came in the flesh"; [25] and hence the inference is that he regards Him as a divine being. This inference becomes quite certain when considered in the light of the doxology already cited in a preceding paragraph. For there he not only gives glory to God the Father through the Son, but accords the same glory to the Son and the Holy Spirit as to the Father,[26] which he certainly could not have done unless he considered all three to be truly God.

The "Martyrium Polycarpi" is more explicit. The Jews, it seems, had spread a rumor to the effect that the Smyrnian Christians would henceforth worship Polycarp instead of Jesus Christ. In answer to this the Christians protest that such a suggestion is absurd, because, whilst they love and venerate the martyrs as disciples and imitators of the Lord, they "adore Christ as the Son of God." [27] This shows how well these early Christians understood the nature of Christ's divine sonship. They conceived it as a sonship that entitled Him to divine honors, simply because as Son He necessarily possessed the same divine nature as the Father.

Pseudo-Barnabas puts the matter in an equally clear light. "Jesus," he says, "was not the son of man, but the Son of God, made manifest in the flesh. And because men would call Christ the son of David, hence David himself, fearing and understanding the error of the wicked, prophesied concerning Him: 'The Lord said to my Lord: Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thy enemies thy footstool.' . . . Behold how David calls Him his Lord, and not his son." [28] Moreover

[23] I Clem. 36, 2–4.
[24] Polyc. 2, 1; 6, 2.
[25] Ibid. 7, 1.
[26] Martyr. 12, 2.
[27] Ibid. 17, 3.
[28] Barn. 12, 10, 11.

it was necessary that on His coming into this world He should assume a body; for "if He had not come in the flesh, how would men have been able to look at Him, as they cannot even look steadily at the rays of the earthly sun, which at some time shall cease to be and is merely the work of His hands?" It was to the Son that the Father said at the beginning of the world: "Let us make man to our image and likeness." [29]

We find the same definite statements in the letters of Ignatius. Not only does he call Christ "my God," [30] "our God"; [31] but simply "God," and even "the God," (Τὸν Θεὸν) thus using the article, upon which modern critics place so much emphasis in this matter.[32] Again, he states that Jesus Christ is the Word of God,[33] who "before all ages was with the Father," [34] that His blood is the blood of God,[35] and that He raised Himself by His own power from the dead.[36] In fact, so definite is the author in his declaration of Christ's true divinity that it is hard to see how he might have expressed himself more forcibly. And yet modern Rationalists are not satisfied. They say that in other places Ignatius speaks of Jesus as the "Son of man and of God," as being "of God and of Mary," as "the Son of God according to the will and power of God,[37] as if he attributed the Godhead of Christ to His miraculous birth, thus taking the term, "Son of God," in an improper sense. They entirely overlook the fact that according to Ignatius Jesus is the "Son of God and of man" because He is God Incarnate.

The Secunda Clementis is hardly less clear and definite on this point. At the very beginning of his discourse, the preacher tells his audience: "Brethren, we ought so to think of Jesus Christ as of God, as the judge of the living and the dead." [38] Harnack regards this as undecisive, suggesting that the author called Christ God simply because of His position in the economy of salvation.[39] But how far this subtile dis-

[29] Ibid. 5, 10; 5, 5.
[30] Rom. 6, 3.
[31] Ibid. 3, 3; Ephes. 15, 3; Polyc. 8, 3.
[32] Smyrn. 1, 1.
[33] Magn. 8, 2.
[34] Ibid. 6, 1.
[35] Ephes. 1, 1.
[36] Smyrn. 2, 1.
[37] Ibid. 1, 1; Ephes. 20, 2.
[38] II Clem. 1, 1.
[39] Op. cit. 206, notes 3, 4.

tinction was from the author's mind appears with sufficient clearness from the fact that he introduces Christ's own words with the formula: "God said,"[40] that he makes Jesus not only the Redeemer but also the Creator of the world,[41] that he refers to the Saviour as the object of our worship,[42] and repeatedly speaks of Him as if He were the only Lord and God in heaven and on earth;[43] all of which, strange to say, Harnack himself admits a few lines further on.

The only one of all these writers who is unsatisfactory in his statements concerning the divinity of Christ is Hermas. He holds, indeed, that the Son is truly God, but by the Son he appears to understand the Holy Spirit.[44] The divinity of Jesus he seems to admit only in so far as the Holy Ghost has taken up His abode in Him, and as, on account of His merits, this Jesus was subsequently adopted into the divine family circle.[45] Some have tried to read an orthodox meaning into all this, but the matter remains rather doubtful. Nor would this doctrinal confusion be inexplicable. For being a man of little education, as is commonly admitted, and relying largely on his own wisdom, as appears from several other places in his writings, it may be assumed that the author simply misinterpreted the text of St. Luke, which records the descent of the Holy Ghost upon Jesus at His baptism. Neither is it difficult to understand, how, in spite of this Adoptionist view, the work should have been so highly esteemed in the early Church; because, as the author is constantly dealing in visions and parables, his heterodoxy on this particular point might easily enough escape detection, at least so long as the later Adoptionist heresy had not yet aroused the suspicion of the faithful in this regard.

3°. *The Divinity of the Holy Ghost: The Blessed Trinity.* —On the divinity of the Holy Ghost Hermas is most explicit. Not only does he call Him the Son of God, the adviser of the Father, but also the Creator of all things,[46] who dwells in the

[40] II Clem. 13, 4.
[41] Ibid. 1, 4.
[42] Ibid. 2, 2, 3.
[43] Ibid. 5, 1, 2; 8, 2, 4.
[44] Simil. 5, 5; 9, 1, 1.
[45] Simil. 5, 6, 5, 6, 7; cfr. Funk, PP. Apost. ed. 2, p. 541.
[46] Simil. 5, 6.

faithful as the principle of sanctification.[47] According to Clement, He is the Spirit of God, the author of the Holy Scriptures, which therefore must be accepted as true.[48] He is the Spirit of grace poured out upon us all,[49] who is associated with the Father and the Son as a witness to the truth of God's promises.[50] Ignatius refers to Him incidentally as being instrumental in the sanctification of souls,[51] and as the Spirit who has come from God and knows the secrets of hearts.[52] Twice he mentions Him together with the Father and the Son as if belonging to the same order of being.[53] If we add to these texts the baptismal formula contained in the Didache and the doxology of Polycarp as recorded in the " Martyrium," we have practically all that bears either on the divinity of the Holy Ghost or on the mystery of the Blessed Trinity.

Modern critics usually point out that all this is so vague as to force upon us the conviction that these writers had no definite belief concerning the points in question. That is as much of an exaggeration as the assertion of some Catholic writers that the Apostolic Fathers were as conversant with the mystery of the Blessed Trinity as the great champions of orthodoxy during the fourth and fifth centuries. The truth seems to lie midway. We find here all the elements of the mystery — the unity of God, the divinity of the Son, and less clearly that of the Holy Ghost, together with the coexistence of three divine terms in one Godhead — or the substance of the doctrine *qua factum mysterii;* but to the combination of these elements, in so far as it involved any formal investigation or led to a theoretical exposition, it is not likely that much attention was given at the time. It must be remembered, however, that these matters are touched upon only in passing. Had the writers undertaken to give us a formal treatise on the points in question, the result would most likely bear quite a different aspect.

4°. *The Humanity of Christ and the Unity of Person in*

[47] Ibid.
[48] I Clem. 45, 2, 3.
[49] Ibid. 46, 6.
[50] Ibid. 58, 2.
[51] Eph. 9, 1, 2.
[52] Antioch. 7, 1.
[53] Eph. 9, 1; Magn. 13, 1.

the Saviour.—That Christ was true man is presupposed by all these writers as a matter of universal belief. He comes from Abraham "according to the flesh,"[54] is the "Son of God made manifest in the flesh,"[55] is "our God Jesus Christ borne in the womb by Mary, of the seed of David and of the Holy Ghost."[56] Furthermore, a few of them, like Ignatius and Polycarp, emphasize this point very strongly against the Docetæ, who maintained that Christ's humanity was only a semblance of human nature. "Jesus Christ," says Ignatius, "was truly a descendant of the race of David according to the flesh, truly born of a virgin, and truly baptized by John, that all justice might be fulfilled by Him; for us truly nailed to the cross in His flesh under Pontius Pilate and Herod the Tetrarch."[57] "He suffered truly, as He also raised Himself truly from the dead, and not, as some unbelievers pretend that He only seemed to suffer."[58] And in the resurrection He again took up His body: "For I know that even after the resurrection He was in the flesh, and I believe that He is so now."[59] Polycarp is not less outspoken. "For every one," he says, "who does not confess that Jesus Christ came in the flesh, is antichrist: and whoso does not confess the testimony of the Cross, is of the devil; and whoso wrests the sayings of the Lord to his own desires and says there is to be no resurrection and no judgment, he is the first-born of Satan."[60]

Christ, therefore, is true God and true man; is He then one person in two natures? This seems to be assumed throughout. Like the Evangelists and the Apostles before them, all these writers know only one Christ, who is at the same time the Son of God and the Redeemer of the world. "If the Lord," asks Pseudo-Barnabas, "bore sufferings for our soul's sake, seeing that He is the Lord of the world, to whom God said in the beginning, 'Let us make man to our image and likeness,' how then did He suffer at the hands of men?" And he answers, it was for this reason "that it behooved Him to

[54] Clem. 32, 2.
[55] Barn. 12, 10.
[56] Ignat. Eph. 8, 2.
[57] Smyrn. 1, 2; 2.
[58] Smyrn. 2.
[59] Smyrn. 3, 1.
[60] Polyc. 7, 1.

appear in the flesh, so as to destroy death and show forth the resurrection from the dead." [61] It was not a mere man who suffered and died, but "the Lord of the world," who had assumed a passible nature like our own. "The Lord Jesus Christ," says Clement, "according to the disposition of the divine will, gave His blood for us, His flesh for our flesh, His soul for our souls." [62]

And in this manner they all reason, without ever giving the slightest hint that they distinguished in Christ between the man and God. He is to them one individual, at the same time God and man. Hence, although they did not theorize on the point, the obvious inference is that they assumed such a union between the two elements in Christ as would make Him one person. This, moreover, appears almost to evidence from the letters of St. Ignatius, who treats the matter somewhat more in detail. "There is one physician," he says, "both corporal and spiritual, begotten and unbegotten, God existing in the flesh, true life in death, both of Mary and of God, first passible then impassible, Jesus Christ our Lord." [63] And again: "Expect Him who is above all time, the eternal, the invisible, for our sakes visible, the impalpable, the impassible, for our sakes passible, who has suffered in all manner of ways for our sakes." [64] What can this possibly imply except the unity of person and the distinction of natures in Christ? The author advances indeed no theory about the nature of the union, but he expresses himself in a manner that is justified only on the supposition that he considered it to be hypostatic. He knows only one Jesus Christ, who is at the same time God and man. A modern theologian could hardly place the matter in a clearer light.

5°. *The Redemption.*—The purpose of Christ's coming is regarded by nearly all of these writers as twofold: To bring us the knowledge of God and to deliver us from the death of sin. "This is the way, beloved, in which we find salvation," writes Clement, "Jesus Christ, the pontiff of our oblations, the advocate and helper of our infirmity. Through Him we

[61] Barn. 5, 5, 6.
[62] I Clem. 49, 6.
[63] Eph. 7, 2.
[64] Polyc. 8, 2.

behold the heights of the heavens; . . . through Him the Lord willed that we should taste immortal knowledge." [65] "Let us fix our eyes upon the blood of Christ, and know how precious it is in the sight of God His Father; it was shed for our salvation and brought the grace of repentance to the whole world." [66] "Jesus Christ," says Ignatius, "who is the thought of the Father, the truthful mouth by which the Father expresses Himself, has become for us the knowledge of God and our teacher." [67] "He bore all His sufferings for our sakes, that we might obtain salvation; and He truly suffered, as He also truly raised Himself from the dead." [68] Even Hermas, who, as we have seen, probably went astray on the divinity of Christ, bears witness to the prevalence of this view in regard to Christ's coming into this sinful world. "God," he says, "planted a vineyard, that is, He created a people, and gave it to His Son; and the Son placed angels over the people for their protection; and He Himself washed away their sins, laboring much and sustaining many trials; for no vineyard can be cultivated without labor and sorrows. He therefore having washed away the sins of the people, showed them the ways of life, giving them a law which He received from His Father." [69]

It is especially deserving of notice that these writers are perfectly familiar with the theory of vicarious satisfaction, which modern critics usually consider as a later development. When Clement states that "our Lord Jesus Christ, according to the disposition of the divine will, gave His blood for us, His flesh for our flesh, His soul for our souls," [70] he evidently goes on the supposition that Christ was put in our place, that "Him who knew no sin, for us God hath made sin, that we might be made the justice of God in Him," as St. Paul expressed it in his Second Epistle to the Corinthians. It is in the same sense that Ignatius tells the Christians of Smyrna: "But all things He has suffered for our sakes, that we might obtain salvation." [71]

[65] I Clem. 30, 1, 2.
[66] Ibid. 7, 4.
[67] Cfr. Eph. 3, 2; 17, 2; Rom. 8, 2.
[68] Smyrn. 2.
[69] Simil. 6, 2, 3.
[70] I Clem. 49, 6.
[71] Smyrn. 2.

This is brought out with greater emphasis by Pseudo-Barnabas in his reasoning against the Jews. He tells them that they have no cause to be scandalized at the sufferings and shameful death of the Saviour, since these are no sign of His weakness but rather a proof of the needs of our sinful nature. "If the Son of God, He who is the Lord and shall judge the living and the dead, suffered, it was because He wished to give us life by His stripes." "Be sure that the Son of God could not undergo sufferings save on our account; He gave His own body as a sacrifice for our sins." "The Lord willed to deliver His body that by the forgiveness of our sins we might be sanctified, which is effected by the aspersion of His blood; for it is written: He was wounded for our iniquities and bruised for our sins, by His bruises we are healed." "If He suffered, it was for our souls, . . . to destroy death and to bring about the resurrection of the dead, and to fulfill the promise made to our fathers that He would prepare unto Himself a new people." [72]

6°. *The Church of Christ.* — In one way or another, all these writers assume that the fruits of the redemption are laid up for the individual in the Church, which was founded by Christ and locally established by the Apostles and their disciples. The two who especially enlarge on this point are Clement and Ignatius, although the others also bring out the same idea.

Clement's teaching on the Church is based on the principle of unity through authority. The Gospel of Christ, he says, has been preached in the whole world, His elect are everywhere; they are His people, a holy portion reserved to Himself. They form His body, and the unity of that body they must ever preserve. [73] "Let us mark," he tells the Corinthians, "the soldiers that are enlisted under our rulers, how exactly, how readily, how submissively, they execute the orders given them. All are not eparchs, or rulers of thousands, or rulers of hundreds, or rulers of fifties, and so forth; but each

[72] Cfr. Barn. 5, 11, 12; 14, 6; 7, 2, 3; 5, 1, 2, 6, 7; 14, 4; 6, 11.

[73] I Clem. 5, 7; 49, 2, 3; 30, 3.

man in his own rank executeth the orders given by the king and his chief officers." [74]

For the building up of this body, Christ sent His Apostles, even as He was sent by the Father. "Christ, therefore, was sent by God, and the Apostles were sent by Christ: so both were sent orderly, according to the will of God." [75] Hence the community of the faithful, governed by proper authority, has Christ for its founder; and therefore those who foment schism set at naught the divine ordinances, they "tear asunder the members of Christ." [76]

The Apostles in their turn, after preaching the Gospel in country places and in cities, chose men of approved virtue and made them bishops and deacons, as had already been foreshadowed in the Old Testament, where it is said: I will confirm their bishops in justice and their deacons in faith.[77] And this they did of set purpose, for they well knew that after their death contention would arise over the episcopal dignity. Therefore they ordained that after their going hence other virtuous and holy men should receive their ministry. And these, thus lawfully constituted, cannot, so long as they faithfully discharge the duties of their office, be removed without grave fault.[78]

From this it appears that in the matter of Church government three points were quite clear to the author's mind: First, that there existed in the Church an authority which the faithful were bound in conscience to obey; secondly, that this authority was derived through the Apostles from Christ Himself; thirdly, that the Apostles themselves made provision for its perpetuation. All this he assumes as well known, and therefore he considers it sufficient to call attention to it in passing.

As regards the distribution of this authority, or the various grades of the hierarchy, the author's way of speaking is not clear. He usually designates those entrusted with ecclesiastical functions as presbyters, but in one place he dis-

[74] Ibid. 34, 7.
[75] Ibid. 42, 1, 2.
[76] Ibid. 4, 6, 7.
[77] Ibid. 42, 4; 40, 5.
[78] Ibid. 44, 1, 2, 3, 4, 6; 47, 6.

tinguishes them as bishops and deacons.[79] He also mentions a division into high priest, priests, and levites, each class having its own functions to perform.[80] It is true, this bears direct reference only to the Old Law, but it seems to suppose a similar division of ecclesiastical functionaries in the New Dispensation. He likewise states that at certain definite times oblations must be made and the sacred functions performed, and with this the bishops and deacons are entrusted.[81] It seems that he uses the term "presbyters" as including both bishops and priests, thus following the manner of speaking also found in St. Paul. At all events, these ecclesiastical superiors are the guides of our souls; they must be obeyed and honored.[82]

In this connection must also be mentioned the author's testimony to the Primacy of Rome in the matter of Church government. This is, indeed, only implied, but it is none the less forceful and clear. He puts himself obviously in the position of a judge, and as such holding the place of God. He is writing under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and looks for obedience from those to whom he directs his exhortation.[83] He regrets that circumstances would not allow him to attend to this matter before, but now he will leave nothing undone to bring about peace; and if any there be who will not obey in those things which God commands through Him, they will be guilty of a grievous offense and run a great risk: still, whatever be the outcome of his intervention, he has done his duty and will be without sin before God.[84]

And thus, throughout the whole letter, he speaks as a superior to his subjects, though always in a fatherly way. There is no hesitancy, no weakness, no fear of unauthorized intrusion anywhere. Nor does it make any difference whether we suppose that he was appealed to by the church of Corinth or not; the very fact that he proceeds as one who has a right to command shows that he is conscious of his authority, and also that the Corinthians are supposed to recognize the legiti-

[79] Ibid. 42, 4.
[80] Ibid. 40, 5.
[81] Ibid. 40, 2; 44, 4.
[82] Ibid. 6, 3, 1; 1, 3.
[83] Ibid. 63, 2.
[84] Ibid. 1, 1; 59, 2.

macy of its exercise in adjusting their domestic difficulties. In this we can clearly discern the fundamental idea of the Primacy of Rome as understood at the present time.

According to Ignatius Christ is the "door of the Father, by which Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and all the Prophets, as well as the Apostles and the Church, did enter." Hence he says: "Christianity did not believe in Judaism, but Judaism believes in Christianity, in which are gathered together all those who believe in God." [85] Christ "has set up through His resurrection, in all ages, a standard for the saints and for His followers, whether they be Jews or Gentiles, in the one body of His Church." [86] "Jesus Christ, our inseparable life, is the thought of the Father, as also the bishops, all the world over, are in agreement with the mind of Jesus Christ." [87] Hence "where the bishop shall appear, there let the people also be; as where Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholic Church." [88]

The term "Catholic Church" appears here for the first time, although the doctrine contained in it is found in earlier writers as well. As here used it designates the Church of Christ in her universality, as spread over the whole world, "per tractus terrae," and including the various local communities as integral members. In this sense the epithet seems to have been in common use at the time, or at least a little later, as appears from the "Martyrium Polycarpi," where it occurs three times; but in its secondary meaning, denoting opposition to heretical sects, it was probably not used until the latter part of the second century. It may be noted that Ignatius, although occasionally referring to the "Catholic Church," is nevertheless almost exclusively occupied in his letters with the Church as established in particular communities. Whatever he says about Church government, the need of union among the faithful, or the particulars of divine worship, is primarily intended for local bodies of Christians. Under ordinary circumstances, and in the ordering of its daily life, each community is guided by its own ecclesiastical

[85] Philad. 9, 1; Magn. 10, 3.
[86] Smyrn. 1, 2.
[87] Eph. 3, 2.
[88] Smyrn. 8, 2.

superiors, "the bishop presiding in the place of God, the presbyters holding the place of the Apostolic college, and the deacons having entrusted to them the ministry of Jesus Christ." [89] As long as the faithful are subject to this divinely constituted authority, they do all things according to the mind of God.

The Church thus conceived, as universal in extension yet localized in particular communities, is the house of the Heavenly Father, His family.[90] Therein are stored up the graces of redemption, which are shared in by those who continue in communion with the bishop.[91] "For without the bishop it is not lawful to baptize, nor to celebrate the agape; but whatever he approves of, that is pleasing to God." [92] Owing, no doubt, partly to the heresies and schisms that were then threatening, and partly also to the bishop's position as the center of unity and source of orthodoxy to each particular community, St. Ignatius never tires of admonishing the faithful to be loyal in their adhesion to the bishop. It must, however, be noted that, in all this repeated insistence upon proper subjection, he nowhere says a word in defense of the institution of hierarchical powers and offices. That the hierarchy, in its various grades as he knows them, bishop, priests, and deacons, has a legitimate existence, and is therefore of Apostolic origin, he takes for granted as acknowledged by all, not only in Asia Minor, but "per tractus terrae," all the world over.[93] In this he but reproduces the teaching of St. Clement.

And like that writer, he also bears witness to the Primacy of Rome. This appears in his letter to the Romans. "I do not command," he tells them, "as did Peter and Paul." [94] "You have never envied any one, you have taught others. And I too wish those things to be firm which you teach and command." [95] "Be mindful in your prayers of the church of Syria, which has in my stead God for its pastor. Jesus Christ alone and your charity govern it now in place of its

[89] Magn. 6, 1.
[90] Eph. 6, 1.
[91] Smyrn. 8, 1.
[92] Smyrn. 8, 2.
[93] Eph. 3, 2.
[94] Rom. 4, 3.
[95] Ibid. 3, 1.

bishop." [96] Hence in the inscription of his letter, the author addresses the Church which is "in the place of the country of the Romans" as presiding over the brotherhood of charity, which brotherhood is made up of the faithful dispersed through the various local churches all over the world.[97] Non-Catholic scholars commonly take a different view of this matter, but, as Bardenhewer remarks, this want of agreement on their part is the outcome not of historical criticism as such, but of historical criticism perverted by religious bias. The fact that Ignatius admitted the Primacy of the Roman Church cannot well be doubted, but whether he held it to be of divine origin is not stated.

Hermas also dilates somewhat on the position of the Church in the divine economy of salvation, but owing to his allegorizing tendencies he is less satisfactory. He represents the faithful, stamped in baptism with the seal of spiritual regeneration, as incorporated in the Mystic Tower, which is a figure of the Church of Christ. The Church thus conceived is the new Israel, built upon the foundation of the Prophets and the Apostles, but of which the Son of God is Himself the cornerstone.[98] The Tower is still in building, and God Himself supervises the work. Only perfect stones are used, but in course of time many lose their original perfection. These are then removed from their position and handed over to the Angel of Penance, who cleanses and reshapes them, and thus makes them fit to be once more inserted into the walls of the Tower.[99]

All this is allegorical, but through the allegory one can get a glimpse of the reality that stood before the author's mind. The Tower in its completion and final perfection is, of course, a figure of the Church Triumphant in heaven, but so long as it is in building it also designates the Church Militant on earth. It is a Church in which penance is still of avail, and where the deformity of vice dwells side by side with the beauty of virtue. It is the same Church as that which the author

[96] Ibid. 9, 1.
[97] Cfr. Batiffol, Primitive Catholicism, 140–143; Bardenhewer, Altkirch. Lit. I, 123–124.
[98] Simil. 9, 5, 1, 2.
[99] Simil. 9, 6–7.

elsewhere depicts under the figure of a willow tree, some of whose branches have been cut off and are apparently lifeless; yet, when they are planted in the earth and well watered, they grow again.[100] In its most comprehensive sense, therefore, the Church includes all believers, whether they are still struggling here on earth or have already attained the eternal joys of heaven. Hence the author gives, in outline at least, also the fundamental elements of the Communion of Saints.

In one sense the Church dates from the beginning of the world, and the world was, in fact, created for the Church;[101] but in another sense she has her origin also in the redemption of mankind by the Son of God. "As many as hear His message, and believe, are called in His name. When they have received the baptismal seal, they are all of one heart and mind, having but one faith and one charity."[102] Hence, too, the Tower, which represents the Church, is built "upon the waters."[103] When Hermas asks the reason of this, he is told: "Because your life is saved and shall be saved by water." Without baptism no one can become a member of the Church. This is so true that "the Apostles and the teachers, who preached the name of the Son of God, after they had fallen asleep in the power and faith of the Son of God, preached also to those who had fallen asleep before them, and themselves gave unto them the seal of preaching. Therefore they went down with them into the water and came up again. But these went down alive and came up alive; whereas the others that had fallen asleep went down dead and came up alive."[104] Hence the author holds that all the just, who had died before the advent of Christianity, had to be baptized after their death.

Thus the Church is indeed a spiritual creation, embracing all times and comprising all the saints of God, yet in her concrete existence she is constituted in local and visible communities, into which the members are admitted by a sacra-

[100] Simil. 8, 2, 7.
[101] Vis. 2, 4, 1; 1, 1, 6.
[102] Simil. 9, 17, 4.
[103] Vis. 3, 2.
[104] Simil. 9, 16.

mental rite. In these communities are presiding officers and presbyters to whom the author is directed to read his book, and who sit down first in the assembly of the faithful.[105] Mention is also made of apostles, bishops, teachers, and deacons, some of whom are dead, whilst others are still living.[106] Then there is a certain Clement, who appears to be at the head of them all and to have authority over the whole Church. To him the author must give a copy of his book, that he may send it to other cities.[107] This obviously refers to Clement of Rome, the third successor of St. Peter, whose primatial position thus appears to have been accepted by the faithful as an undisputed fact.

The other writers belonging to this group speak of the Church only in passing. Thus the author of the Didache directs the faithful to pray that the Lord may be mindful of His Church, and gather her from the four winds into the kingdom He has prepared for her.[108] In connection with the Eucharist he speaks of bishops and deacons, whose office it is to celebrate the divine mysteries. "Constitute, therefore, for yourselves bishops and deacons, who are worthy of the Lord; men of gentle character and not greedy of money; men who speak the truth and are of approved virtue: for they also exercise in your behalf the ministry of the prophets and teachers." [109]

Besides bishops and deacons, the author mentions three other classes who exercise various functions of the ministry. They are: (a) Apostles, who are engaged in missionary work, going from community to community, or preaching the Gospel to the heathens. (b) Prophets, who teach and speak in the Spirit. As they are the recipients of special charisms, they hold the most honorable place among Christian ministers. Every sin can be forgiven, except that of speaking against a true prophet. (c) Teachers, who instruct the faithful, but do not speak in the Spirit. Their knowledge is acquired by study, and their lessons must be prepared. All

[105] Vis. 2, 4, 3; 3, 18.
[106] Vis. 4, 5, 1.
[107] Vis. 2, 4, 3.
[108] Didache 10, 5.
[109] Ibid. 15, 1.

three classes are subject to certain trials, and rules are given to distinguish the true from the false.[110]

Pseudo-Barnabas briefly notes that the Saviour gathered together a new nation, a holy people, the heir of those great promises which the Jews had falsely appropriated to themselves. This new nation is the Church of Christ, "the good land, the land of Jacob, the vessel of His Spirit," and as such the depository of spiritual gifts, the organ of the Spirit's manifestation to the world. The Church is holy, for it is the Church of saints; it is also one, so that all schism is to be condemned.[111] However, with regard to the constitution of the Church and ecclesiastical government, the author says nothing definite.

Polycarp implies that the hierarchy consists of three degrees, the bishop, priests, and deacons. He calls particular attention to the virtues required in deacons and priests, and warns them especially against avarice.[112] They have authority over the faithful, who must obey them as they would obey God Himself.[113] Priests, however, should be lenient in their treatment of delinquents, for we are all sinners before God.[114]

The "Martyrium Polycarpi" brings out very prominently that the Church is "Catholic." The term occurs three times in the body of the letter and once in the inscription. Dr. Funk contends that it is here used not merely in its primary sense, denoting universality, but also in its secondary meaning, as implying distinction from the conventicles of heretics. Others, however, do not accept this view, but maintain that in this latter sense the term is met with for the first time in the Muratorian fragment, which originated most likely towards the end of the second century.

The Secunda Clementis refers several times to "presbyters," whose duty it is to instruct the people, and disobedience to whom is sinful before God. "Let us not think to give heed and believe now only, while we are admonished by the pres-

[110] Ibid. 11, 1–12; 13, 2–7.
[111] Barn. 6; 7; 11; 19.
[112] Polyc. 6, 1; 5, 2.
[113] Ibid. 5, 3.
[114] Ibid. 6, 1.

byters; but likewise, when we have departed home, let us remember the commandments of the Lord." Unless we do this, we shall bewail it on the day of judgment, because "we obeyed not the presbyters, when they told us of our salvation."[115]

Besides these incidental references, the author gives the following rather puzzling description of the Church. He assumes that the Church is necessary for salvation, because she is the body of Christ. And she is the body of Christ, "because Scripture says, God made man male and female. The male is Christ, and the female is the Church. And the books of the Prophets and the Apostles plainly declare that the Church is not of to-day, but hath been from the beginning: for she was spiritual, as our Jesus also was spiritual, but she was manifested in these latter days that she might save us. Now the Church, which is spiritual, was manifested in the flesh of Christ, thereby showing us that, if any of us guard her in the flesh and defile her not, he shall receive her again in the Holy Spirit: for this flesh is the antitype of the spirit. No man, therefore, when he hath defiled the antitype, shall receive the reality. Listen then, brethren: Guard ye the flesh, that you may partake of the spirit. But if we say that our flesh is the Church and the spirit of Christ, then he that soiled the flesh hath soiled the Church, and such a one, therefore, shall not partake of the spirit, which is Christ."[116]

This is at best not very illuminating. That the Church is the body of Christ, of course in a mystical sense, is perfectly orthodox, and is evidently derived from the teaching of St. Paul; but the idea of her spiritual pre-existence, as here portrayed, seems altogether foreign to the Christian concept of the Church, although something like it appears also in Hermas. Batiffol suggests that it was derived from Jewish speculations about the heavenly Jerusalem."[117]

7°. *Baptism.*—Entrance into the Church is obtained through baptism, because the Church is "built upon the waters." On

[115] II Clem. 17.
[116] Ibid. 14, 1–5.
[117] O. c. 182, 183.

this all these writers are agreed, in as much as they assume every Christian to have received baptismal regeneration. Hence the author of the Didache says very positively: "Let no one eat or drink of your Eucharist, except he has been baptized in the name of the Lord; for it was in reference to this that the Lord said: 'Do not give holy things to dogs.'" [118] The external rite is thus described by the same author: "After you have said all these things (that is, after you have properly instructed the catechumens), baptize in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, in flowing water. But if you have no flowing water, baptize in any other water; if you cannot baptize in cold water, baptize in warm. But if you have neither (sufficient for immersion), pour water three times on the head in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." [119] The minister and the candidate, and, if possible, some others also, ought to fast one or two days before baptism is conferred.[120]

The effects of baptism are thus neatly described by Pseudo-Barnabas: "We descend into the water full of sins and stains, and we come out of it bearing fruit, having in our hearts the fear, and in our minds the hope in Jesus." [121] Thus baptism is a true renovation and the beginning of a new life, in which the fruits of the redemption are applied to the individual soul. Hence he says in another place: "When, therefore, He renovated us through the remission of sins, He brought it about that we should have another form, to wit, a soul like that of children, seeing that He reformed us." [122] We become in a manner the living temple of God; for "having received the remission of sins, and filled with hope in the name of the Lord, we have become new men, again created in our entirety: for this reason God truly dwells in us, in our own dwelling. How? His word of faith, His calling, His promise, the wisdom of commands, the precepts of doctrine, He himself prophesying and dwelling in us, opening the door, to wit, the mouth, to us who are given up to death, all this

[118] Didache 9, 5.
[119] Ibid. 7, 1, 2, 3.
[120] Ibid. 7, 4.
[121] Barn. 11, 11.
[122] Ibid. 6, 11

inspires us with penance and introduces us into the incorruptible temple." [123]

Hermas speaks almost in the same terms: "Before man bore the name of son of God," he says, "he was dead; but when he received the seal, he put off mortality and resumed life. The water therefore is a seal; they descend into the water in the state of death and come up alive." [124] This new life is marked by union in faith and charity and by moral purity: "Having then received the seal, they had one mind, one faith, and one charity, and they bore within them the spirits of virgins together with the name." [125]

That baptism is a seal which marks the Christian as belonging in a special manner to God, and which carries with it the obligation of a holy life, is also brought out by the author of the Secunda Clementis, who exhorts the faithful to preserve immaculate the "sphragis" or seal, for this will entitle them to everlasting life, while its violation through sin leads to eternal loss.[126] "If we keep not our baptism pure and undefiled," he says in another place, "what confidence can we have of entering into the kingdom of God?" [127] Precisely what these writers understood by the "seal" is not clear, but in view of later developments it may be assumed that they referred to the sacramental character.

8°. *The Holy Eucharist.*—The author of the Didache speaks of the Eucharist in two different places. In chapters 9 and 10 he gives the prayers to be said before and after receiving, at least according to the more common interpretation of the passage. Here the consecrated elements are called "spiritual food and drink," which those only are allowed to receive who "have been baptized in the name of the Lord." In chapter 14 he says: "But on the Lord's Day coming together break bread and give thanks, after you have confessed your sins, so that your sacrifice may be pure. And let no one who has a controversy with his friend associate with you, until they have been reconciled, lest your sacrifice should be made unclean.

[123] Ibid. 16, 8, 9.
[124] Simil. 9, 16, 3, 4.
[125] Simil. 9, 17, 4.
[126] II Clem. 7, 6; 8, 6.
[127] Ibid. 6.

For this was said by the Lord: In every place and at all times let there be offered to me a clean sacrifice, because I am a great king, saith the Lord, and my name is wonderful among the Gentiles." Hence the author evidently regards the Eucharistic rite as the Christian sacrifice, but he makes no explicit mention of the Real Presence.

Clement also refers to the Eucharist as a sacrifice, when he tells the Corinthians that they must do all things which the Lord has enjoined to be performed at stated times. "For He commanded that oblations should be made and that the sacred functions should be performed, not carelessly and without due order, but at stated times and hours." [128] And then he instances how God had made similar regulations for the priests of the Old Law.[129]

All this, however, is more fully treated by Ignatius, who comes back to it again and again in his exhortations to union with the bishop. Thus, writing to the Ephesians on the necessity of perfect union, he reminds them that they "are breaking one and the same bread, which is the medicine of immortality, the antidote against death, and causes us to live forever in Christ Jesus." [130] He uses the term "Eucharist" not only to designate the ritual action, but also to signify the consecrated elements themselves. Speaking of the Docetæ, he says that "they abstain from the Eucharist and prayer, because they do not confess that the Eucharist is the flesh of the Saviour, which has suffered for our sins and which the Father has raised up from the dead in His kindness." [131] In this, as is quite evident, the Real Presence is not only assumed or implied, but explicitly stated. The same is true of several other texts, as, for instance, when he writes to the Romans: "I take no delight in the food of corruption, nor in the pleasures of this life: I desire the Bread of God which is the flesh of Jesus Christ, who is of the seed of David." [132] Hence when in other places he speaks of the Eucharist as a symbol and bond of union, he cannot possibly intend, as some modern

[128] I Clem. 40, 1.
[129] Ibid. 40, 5.
[130] Eph. 20, 2.
[131] Smyrn. 7, 1.
[132] Rom. 7, 3.

critics maintain, that the Saviour's presence in the consecrated elements is only symbolic. As Ignatius understands it, the body and blood of Jesus are really present, and because of their real presence the Eucharist is the symbol and bond of union. He also makes reference to the Christian sacrifice, when he writes that "there is but one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one chalice in the unity of his blood, one place of sacrifice, as also there is one bishop with the presbyterium and the deacons." [133]

9°. *Penance.* — Although these writers consider baptism as the beginning of a new life, which ought to be free from sin, nevertheless they all refer to penance as a matter of necessity for the ordinary Christian. They also give to this penance a kind of official character, which connects it in some way with the ministration of the Church. Thus the author of the Didache tells his readers in two different places that they must confess their sins in the Church,[134] and this direction is repeated by Pseudo-Barnabas.[135] When Clement exhorts the disturbers of the peace at Corinth to do penance, he bids them to submit themselves to the presbyters.[136] Ignatius tells the Christians at Philadelphia that "God remits the sins of all penitents, if they repent, acknowledging the unity of God and following the counsel of the bishop." [137] Polycarp admonishes the priests at Philippi to be lenient in their treatment of delinquents,[138] and the author of the Secunda Clementis exhorts his hearers to do penance for the sins which they have committed in the flesh, so that they may be saved by the Lord whilst they have time to repent. "For after we have departed this life, we can no longer confess and do penance." [139]

The matter is more fully treated by Hermas, who made it the burden of his entire book. He has heard it said by some that the only efficacious penance is the one connected with baptism, when a full remission of former sins is granted; and he has also heard it said by others that there is no need of

[133] Philad. 4.
[134] Didache 4, 14; 14, 1.
[135] Barn. 19, 12.
[136] I Clem. 57, 1.
[137] Philad. 8, 1.
[138] Polyc. 6, 1.
[139] II Clem. 8, 2, 3.

penance: but neither of these views is acceptable.[140] For penance is certainly necessary, and it is also efficacious after baptism.[141] However, efficacious penance is possible only for sins committed up to the time of his writing; those who avail themselves of it are assured of forgiveness, but if after that they sin again they run a great risk, they shall hardly be saved.[142] Hence for Christians there is only one penance, granted them by the merciful God who knows the weakness of human nature. This penance, however, is conceded to all; not even the wicked race of apostates, whose plight appears so desperate, is excluded from it: they, too, may thereby be restored to their former place.[143]

From this reasoning of the author some have concluded that the penance here mentioned was by way of a special concession, "a kind of jubilee," as Tixeront words it; but the text points the other way. When Hermas says to the Shepherd, "I have heard, sir, from certain teachers, that there is no other repentance than that which took place when we went down into the water and obtained remission of our former sins," the latter replies indeed, "Thou hast well heard, for so it is"; but he adds that this is to be the rule for the future, though it was not so in the past. "To those then that were called before these days the Lord hath appointed repentance, . . . but I say unto you, if after this great and holy calling any one, being tempted by the devil, shall commit sin, he hath only one repentance."[144]

Hence what is new in the author's teaching is not that sins are forgiven after baptism, but that in future there shall be no such forgiveness. The common belief therefore had been that post-baptismal sins might be blotted out by penance, and this Hermas feels constrained to admit; but he tries to make a compromise with the "certain teachers," obviously only a few, who hold that there is no other remission of sins except through baptism. For the past, he says, this was not so; but it is to be the law for the future. Hence the further

[140] Mandat. 4, 3, 1; Simil. 8, 6. 5.
[141] Vis. 3, 7, 2; 8, 6, 3, 11, 3.
[142] Mandat. 4, 3, 46.
[143] Simil. 8, 2, 8, 9; 9, 14.
[144] Mandat. 4, 3.

words of the Shepherd: "For the Master swore by His own glory, as concerning His elect; that if, now that this day a limit has been set, sin shall hereafter be committed, they shall not find salvation; for repentance for the righteous hath an end; the days of repentance are fulfilled for all the saints; whereas for the Gentiles there is repentance until the last day." [145] What the author dislikes so much in the Christians of his day, is their constant vacillation between sin and repentance; and to correct this, he cuts off for the future all hope of forgiveness.

Whether the forgiveness of post-baptismal sins depends in any way on the intervention of the Church, is not stated by the author in so many words; yet he seems to imply it all through his book. Thus the "Aged Matron" who gave him the little book on penance is none other, he is told, than the Church. It is she, therefore, to whom this matter of penance has been entrusted. Again, he brings penance into so close a connection with baptism, that its relative position in the Church may well be considered the same. Both are means of obtaining the forgiveness of sins; the one being intended for converts at the time of their admission into the fold of Christ, and the other for Christians after they have strayed from the fold. The former he knows to be applied by the Church, and the most reasonable inference is that he holds the same with regard to the latter.

This, furthermore, appears also to some extent from the manner in which he speaks about the various requisites for efficacious penance. Not only must one be truly sorry for past sins, and have a firm purpose of amendment, but there is also need of certain works of penance which must bear a more or less exact proportion to the number and gravity of the sins committed.[146] In this he seems to refer to some system of public penance that must have been regulated by the Church. For it is not likely that he would have excogitated all this himself, that is, without being guided by what was actually going on in the community of which he was a member.

What must especially be noted here, and the same is true

[145] Vis. 2, 2. [146] Simil. 7, 4; 6, 4.

in respect to all the other writers of this group, is that no sins whatever are excepted from the promise of forgiveness if all the necessary conditions are complied with. Heretics, apostates, adulterers, all can obtain the remission of their sins, provided they truly repent. Hence the general exhortation to penance: "As many as do penance from their hearts, and purify themselves of their iniquities, and do not add to their evil deeds, shall receive from God the forgiveness of their former sins, if so be that they do not entertain any doubts concerning these precepts and will live unto God. But those who add sin to sin, and walk in the evil ways of this world, will thereby condemn themselves to death." [147]

10°. *Matrimony.* — This is touched upon in passing by Ignatius and Hermas. The former says: "It is becoming that the bridegroom and bride contract marriage in conformity with the ruling of the bishop, so that their nuptials may be according to the Lord, and not as suggested by passion." [148] The latter points out the indissolubility of the marriage bond and the lawfulness of second marriages. If a man detects his wife in adultery, let him send her away; but he must not marry again during her lifetime: if he does, he himself becomes guilty of adultery.[149] If a marriage is broken up by death, the surviving party does not sin by contracting another marriage; still it is more meritorious to remain single.[150]

11°. *Eschatology.* — In one way or another all touch on this point, holding out the hope of eternal blessedness to those who lead good and virtuous lives, and the prospect of never-ending sufferings to such as live and die in sin.[151] In this they usually reproduce Scriptural data, without entering into details. The resurrection of the body, the judgment of the living and the dead, and the eternity of heaven and hell, these form the contents of their eschatological teaching. It may be noted, however, that the author of the Didache seems to limit the resurrection to the just only,[152] and that Pseudo-

[147] Simil. 8, 11, 3.
[148] Polyc. 5, 2.
[149] Mandat. 4, 1, 4-6.
[150] Mandat. 4, 4, 1, 2.
[151] Cfr. Hermas, Simil. 9, 18, 2; 8, 2; Ignatius, Eph. 16, 2; Polyc. 2, 3; 6, 2.
[152] Didache 16, 7.

Barnabas holds there will be a Millennium before the final consummation of things.[153]

Many other points of doctrinal value are brought out by these writers, which the want of space forbids us to consider in this connection. Thus, Hermas, for instance, has much to say about the angels as ministering spirits; the "Martyrium Polycarpi" points out most clearly the difference between divine worship and the veneration of martyrs, and all of them emphasize the necessity of faith and good works for the attainment of salvation. As already pointed out, these writings are almost entirely of a practical character, so that points of dogmatic import are usually brought in to drive home a lesson in right living; yet in spite of this, we find here an outline of Catholic teaching that is almost complete in its fundamental doctrines. There is room indeed for development, but there is no need of change in order to bring this incidental teaching of the sub-Apostolic past in connection with the fuller exposition of the actual present. This, however, will appear more clearly in the following chapters.

And here it must be noted how conservative these writers themselves are, how chary of innovation. They have received a message from their predecessors in the faith, and that message they are careful to hand down unaltered. "Do not deviate from the commandments of the Lord," says the author of the Didache, "but guard what thou hast received, neither adding thereto nor taking aught away from it." [154] "Those who foment schisms," writes Clement, "tear asunder the members of Christ." [155] "If any one speaks to you without Christ," says Ignatius, "close your ears, do not listen to him." [156] And again: "Do not be deceived, brethren; if any one follows him that causes a schism, he shall not obtain the inheritance of the heavenly kingdom." [157] "If any one wrests the sayings of the Lord to his own desires," adds Polycarp, "he is the first-born of Satan." [158] No matter how familiar these writers might be with Greek thought and Greek philosophy,

[153] Barn. 4, 13.
[154] Didache 4, 13.
[155] I Clem. 4, 6, 7.
[156] Trall. 9, 1.
[157] Philad. 3, 3.
[158] Polyc. 7, 1.

they experienced no temptation of thereby widening the deposit of faith entrusted to their keeping. Even of legitimate development there is hardly a trace in their writings, as a reference to the chapter on New Testament teaching will readily show. Their one and only care, the thought ever uppermost in their minds, was to guard and transmit the faith received from the Apostles. If any one dared touch that, and thus preach another gospel than the one which had been preached, he was forthwith put down as "the first-born of Satan," with whom Christians could hold no communion.

CHAPTER VI

HERETICAL TENDENCIES AND PAGAN OPPOSITION TO CHRISTIANITY DURING THE SECOND CENTURY[1]

It was towards the middle of the second century that doctrinal development began to manifest itself along the various lines of Christian thought. Up to that time, as was seen in the preceding chapter, little had been done by the teaching body of the Church besides stating the different revealed truths as they had been handed down by the Apostles. No philosophical inquiry had been made as regarded their full contents; nor had the concrete conditions of Christian life called for such inquiry. The large body of Christians, though not without its representative men, distinguished alike for literary attainments and social position, was on the whole made up of simple folk, who were well satisfied to know that Jesus Christ was the Son of God, that He had come to save a sinful world from death, that He wished His followers to cling together as a chosen nation, that He was still in their midst, governing them through His authoritative representatives and nourishing them with His flesh and blood, and held out to all the promise of eternal life, if they would but strive to follow in His footsteps. But how all this was to be explained, what was the ultimate rational setting of these revealed verities, and how these verities themselves might be put into exact theological concepts and set forth in apt definitions, had, with perhaps a few exceptions, not even begun to dawn upon the minds of the most progressive teachers. The fact of revelation was known, and the contents of the *deposi-*

[1] Cfr. Duchesne, The Early History of the Church, I, 112–143; Bardenhewer, Altkirch. Litt. I, 315–347; *Bethune-Baker, Op. cit. 76–93; Tixeront, H. D. I, 153–190; Hergenroether-Kirsch, Handbuch der allgemeinen Kirchengeschichte, 4th Ed. I, 144–183. This last named author gives a singularly clear and full exposition of Gnosticism.

tum fidei were readily accepted, but the rational side of these contents was still an unexplored world.

This could, however, not go on indefinitely. Little by little men trained in the various schools of Greek thought, who were eagerly in search of the true philosophy of life, came in contact with this new teaching, and, as a necessary consequence, subjected it to critical investigation along rational lines of inquiry. Some of them surrendered themselves to it with a whole-souled singleness of purpose; others accepted it with many reservations; whilst others, again, studied it only for the sake of holding up to ridicule its supposed inconsistencies. All three classes of inquirers, each in its own way, were instrumental in initiating and promoting doctrinal development. There were also, indeed, other contributory causes at work: such as popular calumny on the one hand, and the silent teaching of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of the faithful on the other; but they were, in this respect, more or less subsidiary to the first named, that is, to the efforts of intellectual inquirers into the truths of Christianity.

Of these three classes, thus interested in Christian teaching, the first was made up of orthodox writers, who are commonly called Apologists. The second consisted of men strongly marked by heterodox tendencies, and sometimes openly heretical in their views. The third embraced numerous contemporary pagan authors, and such purveyers of popular calumnies as provoked the Christian Apologists to an active defense of their faith. For clearness' sake and for a better understanding of the general drift of orthodox teaching as contained in the apologetical writings of the time, we shall begin our present inquiry with a brief exposition of the principal Gnostic systems of philosophical speculation along the lines of Christian thought. After this a word may be said about Millennarianism, which found favor both with heretics and some orthodox writers. And finally a summary account must be given of pagan opposition to the faith, as that also had a determining influence on the doctrinal exposition of the Apologists.

A — Gnosticism: Various Systems: Influence on Christian Thought

Gnosticism may be said to rest upon a triple foundation — Oriental mysticism, Greek philosophy, and the Gospel of Jesus. It is, indeed, not always possible to determine from which of these three sources any particular doctrine of the Gnostics is derived, or to affirm that there are no other elements contained in it, nevertheless it is here that we find the general basis on which the various systems are built up. Thus from the Orient comes the idea and conviction that matter is essentially evil, and that therefore the Father-God, the Supreme Good, cannot have created the world. Hence the invention of a demiurge, who is usually identified with the Creator-God of the Old Testament. Hence, too, the Docetic doctrine that the Redeemer, whose divinity is defended by the Gnostics, did not come in the flesh, but merely assumed the appearance of our humanity. Then from Greek philosophy were taken not only the dialectic weapons of defense and attack, but frequently also the intellectual moulds in which current Oriental ideas were cast; and perhaps too, at least in its general concept, the exaggerated view of the abstract nature of God. Finally, the Gospel of Jesus supplied the supernatural material upon which the other elements of Gnosticism were brought to bear, for the purpose of shaping it into a consistent philosophy of life.

In regard to this last point, however, it must be noted that the Gospel of Jesus, as understood and accepted by the Gnostics, is not identical with our canonical Gospels, although they too were made use of; but under this title were gathered certain special traditions, written or oral, which purported to contain secret conversations of the Saviour with some of His Apostles and of His first followers. In these conversations, which occurred after the resurrection, Jesus communicated to a chosen few the most profound mysteries of Gnosticism. Thus originated the gospels of Thomas, of Philip, of Judas, the Greater and Lesser Questions of Mary, and the Gospel of Perfection. It was on account of this claim to secret and

more perfect knowledge, or special gnosis, that the followers of these systems, and more particularly the intellectual aristocracy among them, were labelled Gnostics by those who refused to admit their pretensions.

The first beginnings of Gnosticism are usually traced back to Simon Magus, or Simon of Gitta in Samaria. According to St. Justin, who was a native of those parts, almost all Samaria honored Simon as a god, raised high above all other powers.[2] His doctrine, as summed up by St. Irenæus, was thoroughly Gnostic, but it is probable that some later developments found their way into this summary.[3]

From Samaria Simon's teaching passed to Antioch in Syria, where it was propagated by Menander and Saturninus about the time of Trajan. What particular views of their own they introduced cannot now be determined. Jesus, they held, had only an apparent body, and His mission was to defeat the God of the Jews. It was probably against them that Ignatius of Antioch defended the reality of Christ's human nature.

A little later, Gnosticism found its way into Egypt, where it reached a high degree of development through the labors of two Alexandrians, Basilides and Valentinus, the best representatives of Gnostic philosophy. Their efforts at proselytizing, however, do not appear to have met with any permanent success. The same was the experience of Carpocrates, a Platonic philosopher of Alexandria, who early in the second century founded a sect of his own.

It was about this time that Cerdon, a Syrian by birth, endeavored to make propaganda for Gnosticism in Rome. His efforts, as far as his own system was concerned, proved futile, but he seems to have prepared the way for Marcion, who made a sort of common sense synopsis of Gnostic teaching. This Marcion was the son of a bishop in Asia Minor, and he himself professed to be a follower of St. Paul. About 140 he came to Rome, and shortly after he began to spread his heterodox views. These were based not upon secret sources

[2] Cfr. I Apol. 26; 56; Dial. 120.

[3] Adv. Haer. I, 29–31; cfr. Ibid. 23.

of revelation and higher gnosis, but rather upon anti-Jewish and dualistic tendencies. According to him, there was no agreement possible between the revelation of Jesus and the teaching of the Old Testament; nor between the God of creation and the God of redemption. But how the relation of these two orders of things to one another was to be explained, he did not stop to inquire. His was a practical rather than a speculative mind. Both Cerdon and Marcion were admitted to penance, but they did not persevere.[4]

Owing partly to the severity of its ethical code, and partly to the practical methods of its founder, Marcionism spread rapidly and made many converts. It had its martyrs, too, and resisted with uncommon energy the missionary efforts of Catholics as well as the violence of persecutors. Soon, however, it split up into many sects, headed by such men as Basiliscus, Hermogenes, and Apelles. Of these, Apelles became the most famous. He differed from Marcion chiefly in admitting only one First Principle, ascribing creation not to a second god but to an angel. Some of these sects remained in existence till the seventh century.

It would obviously be impossible, in a compendious work like the present, to trace up the divergent teaching of these different systems, but what was more or less common to them all may be placed under the following heads. With the exception of one or two points, this summary is given by the Abbè Duchesne in his "Early History of the Church." [5]

1°. Matter is essentially evil, hence God can have no connection with the world except through intermediaries emanating from Himself.

2°. The Creator and Lawgiver of the Old Testament is not the true God. He is infinitely below the Father-God, the Supreme First Cause of all being.

3°. Neither did He know the true God, nor did the world, until the appearance of Jesus Christ, who was sent as ambassador from the Father-God.

4°. Between the Supreme First Cause and creation is inter-

[4] Irenaeus, Adv. Haer. 3, 4; Tertull. De Praescrip. 30.

[5] Op. c. I, 127, 128.

posed a complicated series of beings, which somehow constitutes an ideal world. But at some point or other in this series there occurred a catastrophe, utterly destroying its harmony. It was from this primal disorder that the visible world, including its Creator, originated.

5°. In humanity there are some elements capable of redemption, having in one way or another come from the celestial world above the demiurge. Jesus Christ came to effect their deliverance.

6°. As matter is essentially evil, the Incarnation cannot imply a real union between the Saviour's divinity and human nature. Hence the Gospel story is explained by having recourse to a purely moral union, or more frequently by reducing Christ's human nature to a mere semblance of humanity.

7°. Neither the suffering and death, nor the resurrection of Christ, were real. Nor does the future of the predestined include the resurrection of the body. Matter is simply not capable of salvation.

8°. The divine element which has strayed into humanity, that is, the predestined soul, has no solidarity with the flesh. There is a necessary opposition between the two. Hence some teach that the flesh must be annihilated by asceticism, whilst others maintain that the soul cannot be held responsible for the weaknesses of the flesh, and therefore may allow full sway to the lower appetites.

Most writers on the subject are agreed that Gnosticism was for the time being a real danger to orthodox Christianity, especially as not a few of its defenders were men of singular ability; but they also point out that its actual influence was on the whole beneficial rather than injurious, although only in an indirect way. Once recognized as heretical, its leading tenets aroused strong opposition, and thus discredit was thrown on all leanings to dualism, on the negation of free will, and on the depreciation of Old Testament teaching. Then, too, by its constant appeal to Apostolic writings and traditions, it hastened the authoritative determination of the canon of Holy Scripture and ensured the safeguarding of such traditions as had really been handed down from Apos-

tolic times. Furthermore, it stimulated intellectual activity in orthodox circles, and forced Christian teachers to give an exposition of revealed truths which had till then usually been expressed in Scriptural language. Hence, although it was an evil tree, indirectly it brought forth good fruit.[6]

B — Millennarianism [7]

Taking the term in its general sense, Millennarianism stands for a variety of views adopted by some early Christians in respect of an era of peace and happiness, which they expected would be inaugurated by Christ sometime before the last judgment. They looked forward to the Saviour's second coming, when He would establish on earth a kingdom of perfect justice, over which He together with His saints would reign for a thousand years. Not all, indeed, assigned the exact time limit of a millennium to this period of earthly blessedness, but that duration seems to have been rather commonly accepted, and hence the general term by which these different views were designated.

Millennarianism is generally looked upon as a legacy from Judaism, although some writers on the subject trace it back to Parseeism, the religion of the ancient Persians. At any rate, certain obscure passages in both the Old and New Testament were usually appealed to as affording a Scriptural basis. Thus the great fertility of the earth during the Messianic reign as described by the prophet Joel,[8] the peace and glory of the children of God as pictured by Isaias,[9] the new life of those slain for a testimony to Jesus, and especially their rule with Him for a thousand years, as represented by St. John in the Apocalypse [10]— all these and similar predictions, interpreted in a literal sense, were held to contain God's own promise of a millennium of earthly happiness.

The different views, collectively designated as Millennari-

[6] Cfr. * Bethune-Baker, Op. cit. 91. 92.

[7] Atzberger, Geschichte der christlichen Eschatologie innerhalb der vornicaenischen Zeit; Funk, Patres Apostolici, 2, 276; Tixeront, H. D. I, 199 sqq.

[8] Joel, 3, 17–21.

[9] Is. 11, 6–17; 66, 18–23.

[10] Apoc. 20, 1–7; 21.

anism, may be divided into two classes. The first of these represents a gross and extreme form of Millennarian expectations, according to which the just, after their resurrection, were to live here on earth a life of coarse sensual pleasure, "without law and without shame." This view was, of course, plainly heretical, being in evident opposition to the teaching of Christ and the law of God. According to Eusebius,[11] it formed one of the tenets of the heresiarch Cerinthus. It seems to have also been advocated by the Ebionites, the Marcionites, and some Apollinarians. In the first half of the third century it was openly defended by Nepos, an Egyptian bishop; also by a certain Coracion, who is said to have drawn "whole dioceses over to his side." [12] This gross form of Millennarianism was strongly attacked by Caius, a Roman presbyter, who wrote during the latter part of the second century. Three quarters of a century later, it found a valiant opponent in Dionysius of Alexandria, whose efforts were so successful that he put an end to Millennarian teaching in the East.[13]

The second class of views is commonly designated as Moderate Millennarianism. This, again, is divided into two kinds. Some represented the happiness of the just, whilst reigning with Christ on earth, as largely made up of material enjoyment; although they carefully eliminated everything of an immoral nature. Of this form of teaching we have a sample in the writings of Papias, who during the early part of the second century was bishop of Hierapolis. In a fragment of his book, entitled "Explanatio Sermonum Domini," he says: "The day will come when vines shall spring up that have each ten thousand branches, and each branch ten thousand offshoots, and each offshoot ten thousand smaller offshoots, and each smaller offshoot shall bear ten thousand clusters, and each cluster ten thousand grapes, and each grape shall yield twenty-five measures of wine. And when one of the saints shall reach out his hand for a cluster, another cluster will cry out: 'I am the better one: take me, and through me

[11] Hist. Eccl. 3, 28.
[12] Ibid. 6, 35; 7, 24.
[13] Ibid. 3, 28, 1, 2; 8, 24, 25; 6, 35.

bless the Lord.'" [14] Lactantius, who wrote towards the end of the third century, points to a similar condition of things during the expected Millennium.

Other writers, however, took a more spiritual view of the thousand years of earthly happiness. Tertullian, when already a Montanist, described the Millennium as the heavenly Jerusalem that was to come down upon earth. Therein, he says, is prepared for the just an equivalent of spiritual joys and blessings for all they suffered and sacrificed in the cause of Christ.[15] St. Irenæus also emphasized this spiritual aspect. "The just," he writes, "shall reign upon earth, growing in perfection because of the vision of the Lord, and through Him they shall become accustomed to beholding the glory of the Father; they shall also hold converse and live in closest union with the holy angels." [16]

This form of Millennarianism is more or less clearly taught in the writings of Pseudo-Barnabas, Justin Martyr, Methodius of Olympus, Commodianus, Victorinus of Pettau, and Quintus Julius Hilarion. Augustine also seems to have favored it at first, but later in life he definitely rejected every form of Millennarian teaching.[17]

It must be noted that besides the above mentioned writers, none others are found in Patristic times of whom it can be affirmed with any degree of certainty that they lent their support to these fanciful speculations. Hence Millennarianism, even in its most moderate form, was in no proper sense of the term a part of Christian belief. Not only were its supporters few in number, but, with the exception of St. Justin, St. Irenæus, and St. Methodius, all of them were either men of mediocre ability or else infected with heresy.

C — Pagan Opposition

Soon after the middle of the first century, when Christianity began to make rapid progress and some of its doctrines became imperfectly known to the pagans, a storm of opposition was

[14] Funk, PP. Apost. II, 276 sqq.
[15] Adv. Marc. 3, 24.
[16] Adv. Haer. 5, 35, 1; 5, 32, 1.
[17] De Civit. Dei. 20, 7, 1; 6, 1, 2; 7, 2; 9, 1; Serm. 259, 2.

raised that made the position of the faithful extremely precarious. This opposition arose in the first instance from the populace, which charged the Christians with all manner of crimes — atheism, impiety, infanticide, cannibalism, and the like.[18] The Christians on their part, when the opportunity offered, answered these calumnies by emphatic denials and appeals to facts; but this availed little, since it was practically impossible to make the sublime nature of Christian worship intelligible to a people steeped in moral corruption.[19]

Then, in the early part of the second century, these popular outbursts began to be followed up by systematic attacks on the part of pagan philosophers, who saw their prestige interfered with by the efforts of Christian teachers. These men, for the most part untrained in the subtleties of reasoning and the graces of speech, were leading away the multitude; and their doctrine, though so repugnant to the merely human in man, made far more impression than the most learned disquisitions on the philosophy of the day. Hence the aggrieved parties were unsparing in their ridicule and contempt, sometimes engaging the Christian teachers in debate, as did the cynic Crescens, and at other times attacking them in writing, as was done by Fronto, Lucian, and Celsus. Of these writings, however, it is only "The True Discourse" of Celsus that has come down to us with any sort of completeness. A brief analysis of it will give us an idea of the lines of attack followed by these philosophers.

Celsus was an eclectic Platonist, and he published "The True Discourse," about 178, although in all likelihood he had employed his trenchant pen against the Christians long before that date. He seems to have been a highly cultured man of the world, who took a general interest in philosophy and attacked Christianity professedly because of its opposition to the State religion. He was, however, honest enough to study its doctrines before he attacked them. His work shows that he had read the Bible and many Christian books, that he knew the difference between the Gnostic sects and the main body

[18] Athenag. Supplic. 3.

[19] Justin, I, Apol. 13, 14; Tatian, Orat. 4.

of the Church, and that he understood to some extent the relation of Christianity to the Jewish religion. Thus prepared he began his task. But, strange to say, nobody seems to have taken much notice of his book until about fifty years later, when it fell into the hands of Origen, who thoroughly refuted it, and incidentally preserved its main contents for posterity. It has been reconstructed as follows:

After a general introduction, the author divides his subject into four parts. In the first part he tries to refute Christianity from the Jewish point of view. Here the principal figure is a Jew, who endeavors to show that the Messianic prophecies contained in the Old Testament have not been verified in Christ. In the second part he speaks in his own person, as a pagan philosopher, attacking the Messianic idea directly, thus rejecting both the Christian and the Jewish religion as based upon a false foundation. In the third part he singles out special doctrines and moral precepts, trying to prove that they have been borrowed from other religious systems. Hence, even if the teaching of Christianity is in part deserving of respect, this is no commendation of the Christian religion itself. In the fourth part he argues that in any case the State religion must be accepted, since it has come down from antiquity and is necessary for the well-being of the State.

There is a close resemblance between this argumentation of Celsus and that of modern Rationalists, and the refutation of it by Origen is as timely to-day as it was some seventeen hundred years ago. Many new adversaries of Christianity arise as time passes on, but in their stock of objections there is little that is really new.

CHAPTER VII

SECOND-CENTURY APOLOGISTS AND THEIR LITERARY ACTIVITIES[1]

From the very first preaching of the Gospel, and in every place where the message of Christ had been accepted, Christian communities took a decided stand against all teaching that came in conflict with the doctrine announced by the Apostles. The author of the Didache, Hermas, Ignatius, and Polycarp, were as definite in their denunciations of heretical pretensions as had been the Apostles themselves in similar circumstances. However, it was only when men who had been trained in philosophy, and whose lives were more or less devoted to literary labors, had entered the Church, that a formal defense of Christianity was taken up against its many and persistent adversaries. These men, because of the task they set themselves, were already in ancient times spoken of as Apologists.

The chief aim of these Apologists, as gathered from their own writings, was to clear Christians from the reproach of crimes attributed to them under the influence of prejudice, to obtain for them tolerance and a fair application of the State laws, and to show that the doctrines they professed rightly claimed the attention, respect, and even the assent of thoughtful minds. In addition to this, they also vigorously opposed all deformation of Christian truths by dreaming heretics, and they consequently had many an opportunity of expounding the contents of the faith in accordance with the teaching of the Church. A few of them, like Justin and Aristo, also

[1] Cfr. Tixeront, H. D. I, 123–139; Duchesne, The Early History of the Church, I, 148–156; Bardenhewer, Patrol. 44–70; Feder, Justins Lehre von Jesus Christus; Picard, L'Apologie d'Aristide; Batiffol, Primitive Catholicism, 192–197.

directed their efforts against the Jews, partly for polemical and partly for doctrinal reasons.

As may be inferred from references to their works in ancient writers, there was quite a large number of early Christian authors who devoted their literary ability to the defense of the faith, and who are therefore rightly numbered among the Apologists. In the present connection, however, only those can be taken notice of whose works, either whole or in part, are still extant. They are the following, arranged as far as possible in chronological order:

1°. Aristides of Athens, a philosopher, who between 156 and 161 sent an apology to the Emperor Antoninus Pius.

2°. St. Justin Martyr, a native of Palestine. After the manner of philosophers in those days, he wandered from place to place, seeking and dispensing wisdom, until, between 163 and 167, he died a martyr's death in Rome. He was the author of many works, but those still extant are only his *First Apology to Antoninus Pius* his *Second Apology,* which seems to be supplement to the preceding, and his *Dialogue with the Jew Trypho.* They were written about the middle of the second century, but the exact date of their composition is not known.

3°. Tatian the Assyrian, a philosopher, and disciple of St. Justin. Shortly after his conversion to the faith, about 165, he published an apology entitled *Oratio ad Græcos,* which is, in effect, a criticism of Hellenism. He also composed a so-called *diatesseron,* a *Gospel-harmony,* of which many fragments are still extant. Before his death he fell away from the faith and became a Gnostic.

4°. Melito, bishop of Sardis in Lydia, who died about 190. He was a most prolific writer, but of all his many works only a few fragments remain.

5°. Athenagoras, "the Christian Philosopher of Athens." He is the author of an apology presented to the Emperors Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus Commodus, under the title, *Supplicatio seu Legatio pro Christianis.* He also wrote a work on the resurrection of the dead. The apology was composed about 177; the date of the second work is not known.

6°. Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, the sixth successor of St. Peter. He wrote the three books *Ad Autolycum,* wherein he explains to his friend Autolycus, still a pagan, the nature of the Christian faith and of the invisible God, shows up the folly of pagan idolatry, and refutes the various charges brought against the Christians. The probable date of the work is about 170.

7°. The unknown author of the "Letter to Diognetus." The letter was probably written some time in the second century, but the exact date has not been ascertained. It is a reply to certain questions asked by a heathen much interested in Christianity. These questions deal chiefly with the Christian adoration of God, as distinguished from the pagan and Jewish worship, and with the remarkable change of life observed in converts to Christianity.

8°. Minucius Felix, a Roman jurist. He is the author of an apology entitled *Octavius.* It is in the form of a dialogue, the interlocutors being the Christian Octavius Januarius and the heathen Cæcilius Natalis. Cæcilius defends the religion of his fathers, whilst Octavius pleads the cause of Christianity. It ends up with the conversion of Cæcilius. The work was probably written in the last quarter of the second century.

9°. Tertullian, a priest of Carthage in Africa. Besides numerous other works, which will be considered in a subsequent chapter, he addressed a defense of Christianity to the governors of the Roman Empire, under the title *Apologeticum.* It was written in 197, and is a refutation of the various charges brought against the Christians.

Taking into account the many works that have been lost, although their authors are known, one cannot help realizing how very considerable was the literary activity displayed in these early ages of the faith. To a great extent, no doubt, this was owing to the difficult position in which Christians found themselves; but it also shows that they had in their midst an ample supply of men who were able to defend the faith, not only by laying down their lives, but equally as well by wielding a trenchant pen. If ever there had been a time

when none but "women and children and timid souls" followed the teaching of the Gospel, as some of the early adversaries of Christianity contended, that time was certainly past.

A — Defense of Christian Morals: Christianity and Philosophy

The teaching of the Apologists may be divided into three parts. They first of all refute the charges of immorality and atheism brought against the Christians by the excited populace and by scoffing philosophers. Then they point out the relation of Christianity to philosophy and to the various religions then in vogue. Lastly they expound Christian teaching by the aid of tradition and sound philosophical principles. Not that this order is always observed by the individual writers, but the three points here mentioned form the burden of nearly all the works now under consideration.

In answer to the charges brought against the Christians, they simply point to the facts of Christian life and faith, which any one of the accusers may investigate if so disposed. These facts show that Christians are neither atheists, nor enemies of the State, nor libertines. But the trouble is that they are condemned unheard, against the explicit provision of the law; and, worse still, the very crimes of which their accusers themselves are guilty are laid to their charge. They observe the law of Christ, and He bids them to worship God, to lead pure lives, to love their enemies, to be kind to the poor and forsaken, and to practice all manner of virtues.

A sample of this kind of defense may be taken from the apology of Aristides, which is illustrative of what is found in the other authors. "The Christians," he says, "derive their origin from Jesus Christ our Lord. He is believed to be the Son of the Most High God. . . . He appeared to men that He might draw them away from the error of polytheism. . . . These, then, are the men who, above all other nations, on earth, have found the truth. For they acknowledge God, together with His only-begotten Son and the Holy Spirit, as the author and fashioner of all things, and beside Him they worship no other god. They have the commandments of

Jesus Christ engraven on their hearts, and they keep them. They do not defile themselves with adultery and the crime of fornication, do not give false testimony, covet not what belongs to others; they honor father and mother, love the neighbor, render just judgment; what they do not wish that others should do them, neither will they do it to others; those by whom they are injured they forgive and try to make their friends; they do good to their enemies, are gentle and easy of access; from all unlawful intercourse and impurity they keep themselves free; they do not despise the widow, nor grieve the orphan, but gladly come to the help of the needy; they receive the stranger under their roof and rejoice in his coming as if he were a brother; for they call one another brother not by reason of the flesh but of the spirit; for the sake of Christ they are ready to lay down their lives, because they steadfastly observe His precepts, living holily and justly, as the Lord has commanded them." [2]

With regard to the relation of Christianity and pagan philosophy there are found among the Apologists different views, as was also the case with the later Fathers. Some of them, like Tatian and Tertullian, spoke as a rule in rather disparaging terms of the works of heathen philosophers; whilst the majority saw in the pre-Christian strivings after wisdom a providential preparation for the sublimer doctrines of revealed truth. They found many points of contact, and sometimes even of identity, between the teaching of Christianity and that of the best philosophers of the various schools. Of course, Christianity, receiving its truths from divine revelation and being supported by divine authority, presents them more clearly and establishes them more firmly; but in this it confirms rather than sets aside what the gropings of philosophy had brought to light in the days of old.

Of this coincidence and partial identity of certain truths, as taught respectively by the Christian religion and pagan philosophy, two explanations are offered. The one, already made use of by the Alexandrian Jews and adopted rather

[2] Aristid, 15.

widely in Christian circles, simply asserted that the pagan philosophers had somehow become acquainted with the contents of the Old Testament and had drawn therefrom the truths set forth in their own teaching.[3] In a few individual cases this might perhaps be so, but as a general rule it could not be sustained. Hence a second explanation was advanced, which found an especially staunch advocate in St. Justin. It is briefly as follows:

According to St. John, the Word is "the true light, which enlighteneth every man that cometh into this world." Hence the Word of God, who is light and life, was in the world from the very beginning; not in visible form, not as a God-Man, but in His invisible communication with the souls of men. Among the Jews He spoke by the Prophets and inspired the sacred writers, whilst among the pagans He enlightened the minds of the philosophers and directed their teaching. It is true, the enlightenment and direction vouchsafed the philosophers was imperfect; it was not real inspiration, and hence they taught many errors; nevertheless, whatever truth is found in their works had its source in Him. Hence between Christian teaching and true philosophy, no matter to what period of time it belongs, there can be no real opposition; for both proceed from the Word, although each in a different way.[4]

This seems to be the meaning of the various passages found in the writings of St. Justin in reference to the matter in question. Here and there it may appear that he held real inspiration in the case of philosophers as well as in that of the sacred writers; but when all he says on the subject is taken into account, this cannot be held. For the enlightenment of which he speaks is, in varying degrees, vouchsafed to all men, and each one receives it according to his capacity, whilst in real inspiration the capacity of the recipient does not limit the divine action.[5]

B — Exposition of Christian Doctrine

In their exposition of Christian doctrine the Apologists do

[3] Justin, Apol. II, 44, 59; Theoph. Ad Autolycum, 2, 37, 36.

[4] Apol. I, 5; 46; II, 8; 10; 13.

[5] Apol. II, 8; 13.

not touch upon all truths taught by the Church at the time, but they are fairly comprehensive, and so their writings form a valuable source of information on matters appertaining to the History of Dogmas. Their arguments, besides such as philosophy supplied them with, are taken indiscriminately from the Old and the New Testament. Both are accepted by them as containing the word of God. It was the Holy Spirit who directed the sacred writers, and He vouches for the truth of their statements. "The Prophets," writes Athenagoras, "were transported out of themselves, and, impelled by the Holy Spirit, they spoke those things wherewith they were inspired, the Holy Ghost using them even as a flute player uses his flute." [6]

When writing against their pagan adversaries, they had frequent occasion for proving the existence of one supreme God, which they usually did by having recourse to the argument of causality, or to the teleological argument drawn from the marvelous order observed in the universe. "He alone is God," exclaims Theophilus, "who separates the light from the darkness, who established the depths of the abyss, and marked the bounds of the sea." [7]

They are quite commonly accused by their critics of overemphasizing God's transcendence and His incomprehensibility to the human mind, but this criticism does not appear altogether just. They were certainly very far removed from making of God a mere abstraction, as did some of the Greek philosophers before them; and also from placing Him in isolated grandeur beyond all contact with the world of His own creation, as did the Gnostics whose theories they rejected as absurd. They ascribe to Him in a preëminent degree the fullness of all physical and moral perfections; He is a God who loves all His creatures, who provides for them, and guides them in all their ways. "Him I call God," writes Aristides, "who created and preserves all things, who is without beginning, eternal, immortal, who stands in need of nothing, and is far above all perturbations and defects.[8] Or as Theophilus

[6] Supplic. 9.
[7] Ad Autolyc. 1, 6.
[8] Apol. 1.

words it: "God derives His name from the fact that He is the source of all stability in this changeable world, and the fountainhead of all action and life. He is without beginning, immutable, immortal; sustaining, ruling, and caring for all things. He is the creator and author of all beings, and His majesty is known and understood from the greatness of His works." [9]

Against both pagan philosophers and Gnostic sectaries they explicitly defend the creation of the world out of nothing, "jussu Dei," and very definitely reject the idea of an eternal *hyle* as postulated by Plato.[10] Nor is this Creator-God an inferior power, a demiurge, but the supreme God Himself, besides whom there is no other God.[11] Harnack, Tixeront, and many others who have written on this subject, point out that the Apologists shrink from bringing the all-perfect God into immediate contact with the finite and the changeable; and that therefore, like Plato and Philo, they postulate an intermediary, a minister, through whom He pronounces the creative fiat. The fact that they do postulate such an intermediary is certain, but whether they were guided in so doing by their exaggerated notion of an all-transcendent God, as these authors maintain, is not so clear. They had before them the teaching of St. John, that "in the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God," and "all things were made by Him, and without Him was made nothing that was made." [12] This contains the fundamental elements of their doctrine on creation, and all they did was to evolve these elements along philosophical lines.

At the same time, however, it may be conceded, and is indeed highly probable, that in the concept of the Creator-Word they sought to combine the traditional teaching of the Church and the postulates of long established philosophical systems. Most of them, as already indicated, had received their early training in the philosophical schools of the day, and it was but natural that this training should influence them in their efforts to give a rational setting to the truths of faith. Within certain limits

[9] Ad Autolyc. i, 4.
[10] Ibid. 2, 4; Aristid. 1, 4.
[11] Ibid.
[12] John, 1, 1, 3.

this was, of course, quite legitimate, but in some respects they seem to have gone beyond these limits. For they introduced certain views, at least as far as the wording goes, which were later on found to be more or less out of harmony with the mind of the Church. We may instance the apparent subordination of the Word and the Holy Spirit to the Father, not only as regards their origin, but also in reference to the perfection of their being. Of this point, however, something more will be said in another paragraph.

First, then, they accepted from the traditional teaching of the Church the unity of God in the strictest sense of the term; and this God they held to be identical with the God of the Old Testament. Hence Justin could say with perfect truth to his friend Trypho: "Neither will there ever be, O Trypho, nor has there been from the beginning, another God besides Him who created and orderly disposed the universe. Nor do we hold that there is one God for us and another for you; but that very one we consider to be God, who led your fathers out of the land of Egypt. . . . Neither do we hope in any other, for there is no other, but in Him in whom you also hope, the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob." [13]

And yet, notwithstanding his emphatic statement that there is only one God, Justin does not hesitate to tell his friend that there is another one to whom this name applies. "I shall endeavor," he says, "to convince you, since indeed you understand the Scriptures, of what I say, namely, that there is and is said to be under the Creator of all things another God and Lord, who is also called Angel, because He announces to men whatever the Creator of all things wishes to make known to them." [14] True, there is only one God, but in this one God there is "another God and Lord."

Nor is there a contradiction in this; for the author says: "Referring to the Scriptures, I shall try to convince you, that this very one who is said to have appeared to Abraham and Jacob and Moses, and who is taught in the Scripture to be God, is another besides Him who created all things — another,

[13] Dial. 11. [14] Ibid. 56.

I say, numerically, not in sense," that is, in being.[15] So there are not really two Gods, but two divine terms, and they are one God.

How is this to be explained? The author tells us a little further on. " By another testimony from the Scriptures I shall also prove to you, my friends, that in the beginning, before all created things, God brought forth from His own self a certain rational power, which by the Holy Spirit is also called the glory of God, and again the Son, Wisdom, Angel, God, the Lord and Word." [16] God, therefore, has a Son, begotten of His own self, who for that reason is also God. He is indeed said to be " a certain rational power," " the glory of God," and " wisdom," but not in an impersonal sense; for He is distinct from the Creator, not in name only, but numerically. " Not as the light is in name only distinct from the sun, but numerically He is something else." [17] Hence those " who say that the Son is The Father, are convicted of error; because neither do they know the Father, nor are they aware that the Father of all things has a Son. And He, as He is the first-begotten Word of God, is also God." [18]

The Word, then, is begotten by the Father; brought forth by him as His Son. How is this to be understood? The author tries to illustrate it by two examples, which, whilst they are necessarily inadequate, still make clear his mind. The first is taken from human speech. Thought may be considered as a mental word, conceived by the mind, and when we utter it, we in a manner bring it forth. In this there is no severing of parts, nor are we by this utterance deprived of the mental word. In some such manner must we understand the divine generation of the Word of God. He remains in the Father and is one with the Father, and yet He is distinct.

The second example is taken from a fire at which another fire is lit. Although it communicates itself, yet it is not thereby diminished, but remains in the same state in which it was before. Similarly in the generation of the Word the

[15] Ibid. 56; Cfr. 58, 59.
[16] Ibid. 61.
[17] Ibid. 128.
[18] I Apol. 63.

Father indeed communicates His being to the Son, but He does so without change.[19]

When did this generation take place? St. Justin says, "in the beginning," "before all things created."[20] Does this mean eternity in the strict sense of the term? The author does not say so in so many words, but there can be no doubt that this is his meaning. For the source of the Word's divinity is precisely His generation by the Father,[21] so that His divine sonship is necessarily coextensive in duration with His divinity, and therefore obviously from all eternity. Whatever may be said in other texts about a sort of second generation in view of the creation of the world, it is sufficiently plain that in the author's mind this had no bearing upon the divine sonship of the Word. He was Word and Son and God before all ages, in every respect coeternal with the Father.

And what St. Justin thus sets forth with considerable attention to details, we find in substance also advanced by the other Apologists. Thus Athenagoras, although strongly emphasizing the absolute oneness of God,[22] points out to his pagan readers that this one God has a Son, the Word, through whom He created and disposed all things. And though distinct from the Father, because He is the Son, He is nevertheless one with the Father. The Son is in the Father, and the Father is in the Son, through the union and the power of the Spirit.[23]

Similarly Theophilus, who says that "the Word was always existing in the heart of God. Before anything was made, the Word was the counselor of the Creator."[24] "And this the Holy Scriptures teach us, and as many as were inspired by the Holy Spirit, among whom was John, saying: 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God,' thus teaching that in the beginning God alone was and in Him was the Word. Then he adds: 'And the Word was God, all things were made by Him, and without Him nothing was made.' The Word, therefore, as He is God and born of

[19] Dial. 61.
[20] Ibid. 48, 61, 62; cfr. II Apol. 6.
[21] I Apol. 63.
[22] Leg. pro Christ. 8.
[23] Ibid. 10.
[24] Ad Autolyc. 2, 22.

God, the Father of all things sends into whatever place He wishes." [25]

The same views we find expressed in the Letter to Diognetus, the unknown author of which calls Christ the beloved, the proper, the only begotten Son of God; the holy and incomprehensible Logos, who is not an angel, but the creator and fashioner of the universe. The Father sent Him into the world both as God and as man, that He might call all men to salvation.[26] He is the proper Son of God, given for the redemption of us all; the holy, the incorruptible, the immortal.[27] He is the Word of God, who was from the beginning, the eternal, who is ever born again in the hearts of the saints.[28]

Again, Aristides tells his readers that Christians derive their name from our Lord Jesus Christ. "He is confessed to be the Son of the most high God, who in the Holy Spirit descended from heaven for the salvation of men. . . . They acknowledge the Creator and Fashioner of all things in His only-begotten Son and the Holy Spirit, and besides Him they venerate no other god." [29] Melito of Sardis says that the same Christ is both God and man, having two natures, the divine and the human; and although here on earth He hid His divinity under the lowliness of the flesh, He is nevertheless true and eternal God.[30] Even Tatian, who, as we shall see below, has some very strange expressions, states quite plainly: "God was in the beginning, and the beginning we understand to be the power of the Word. . . . By Him and by the Word, who was in Him, all things were sustained. . . . The Word was born by a communication, not by abscission. . . . Similarly as when from one torch many fires are lit. . . . Thus the Word, proceeding from the power of the Father, did not cause Him to be without the Word." [31]

Gathering all this together, it appears that regarding the matter in question three points were quite clear and fixed in the minds of the Apologists. 1°. That there is only one

[25] Ibid.
[26] Ad Diognet. 6, 11; 7.
[27] Ibid. 9, 2, 4.
[28] Ibid. 11, 3 sqq.
[29] Apol. 15.
[30] Fragm. 7.
[31] Adv. Graecos, 5.

true God, eternal and unchangeable. 2°. That the Word is in a proper sense the Son of God, distinct from the Father as Son, yet one with Him as God. 3°. That the generation of the Son, as the source of His true divinity, is eternal.

That all this is perfectly orthodox need not be pointed out. It was the faith of the Church at the time, as it had always been, and later on it formed the substance of the Nicene definition. It may be noted, too, that in the texts thus far cited we have chiefly statements of facts, no explanations being attempted by the authors, except that here and there they introduce a few examples by way of illustration. Thus far, then, they may be taken simply as witnesses of tradition, and as such they are safe guides. It is only when they venture to give their own views as Christian philosophers, that they begin to flounder; though even in this respect it may be said that things look worse than they really are.

The chief difficulties may be reduced to the following points. 1°. The Word, though God, is nevertheless "under the Creator of all things."[32] The Father is "ὁ θεός," the God, the Word is simply God.[33] 2°. The Word is in some way uttered or brought forth *ad extra* at the time and in view of the creation of the world. He is the Father's minister, through whom the Father acts upon the world of created beings.[34] 3°. In the Theophanies of the Old Testament it was always the Son who appeared.[35] The Father is "invisible and impassible, who can neither be understood nor be comprehended," who dwells in light inaccessible.[36]

From this it would seem that the Apologists somehow subordinated the Son to the Father, and that they ascribed to Him some sort of temporal generation. There are many authors, and some of them are Catholics, who hold this view. But all things considered, it appears perhaps more probable that the Apologists intended neither the one nor the other. The very fact that they derive the divinity of the Word from

[32] Justin, Dial. 56.
[33] Id. I Apol. 13.
[34] Id. II Apol. 6; Tatian, Adv. Graecos, 5; Theoph. Ad Autol. 2, 22.
[35] Justin, Dial. 127; Athenag. Leg. pro Christ. 10.
[36] Ibid.

His generation by the Father, justifies them in placing Him "sub Creatore universorum," not indeed in respect of the perfection of His being, but *ratione originis*. In this sense also, the Father is "ὁ θεός," the God, because unbegotten and underived Himself, He is the source and origin of the Son. Hence they have no hesitation in saying that the Father and the Son are one.[37] There is a difference between the two, but that does not touch the divine nature which is possessed by both.

Nor is there anything strange in the fact that they speak of the Word as the intermediary and organ of creation; for as Word He is the Father's "thought," the Father's "mind," the Father's "practical knowledge," through which the creative fiat goes forth. In itself this implies no essential subordination, and hence even Theophilus coördinates the Word and the Holy Spirit with the Father in the work of creation. Commenting on the words of Genesis, "Let us make man to our image and likeness," he says: "But these words He did not direct to any one else than to His Word and His Wisdom"; where Wisdom stands for the Holy Spirit.[38]

Apparently there is greater difficulty in giving an orthodox interpretation of what the Apologists, especially Tatian and Theophilus, say about the Word being brought forth *ad extra* at the time of creation. They distinguish between the Word as contained from all eternity in the bosom of the Father, the Λόγος ἐνδιάθετος, and the Word as being uttered in view of the creative work, the Λόγος προφορικος. Thus Theophilus says that the "Word was always existing in the heart of God. Because before anything was made, God used It as His counselor; for it is His mind and His judgment. But when God wished to create those things which He had determined upon, He brought forth this Word outwardly, the first-born of creatures; however not in such a way as to be deprived of the Word, but bringing forth the Word He remained ever united to the same."[39] And Tatian states: "By the will of His (God's) simplicity the Word leaped forth;

[37] Athenag. Leg. pro Christ. 10.
[38] Theoph. Ad. Autolyc. 2, 18.
[39] Ibid. 2, 22.

but the Word, not going forth into emptiness, becomes the first-born of the Father."[40] And this he illustrates by the example of a torch from which other torches are lit, as already explained in a preceding paragraph.

The terms here used appear at first sight very strange; but as all things were created through the Word, is it not possible that these authors intended merely to indicate an outward manifestation of the Word, as it is de facto contained in the created world? This interpretation appears at least much more consistent with what they say about the divinity of the Son and the unchangeableness of God than any other that implies a change in the inner state of the Word. For it must be remembered that a change in the Word necessarily implies a change in the unchangeable God, since, as was pointed out above, in the Apologists' view the Father and the Son are one.

The further difficulty drawn from the Old Testament Theophanies, in which, according to the Apologists, it was always the Son who appeared, has in reality but little bearing on the matter in hand. For these appearances of God among men are very properly appropriated to the Son, both because of His procession from the Father and His position in the divine economy of salvation. Hence Theophilus says very much to the point: "The Word, therefore, since He is God and born of God, the Father sends, when He wishes, into a determined place, and when He has arrived there, He is heard and seen, being sent by the Father."[41] Hence the reason why the Son is sent by the Father is precisely because "He is God and born of God." The Father, being underived, cannot be sent. Justin uses almost the same terms, when he says that no one ever saw the Father, but they saw Him who, being God and the Son of God, carries out the will of the Father.[42]

To this interpretation it is commonly objected that the Apologists conceived the Father to be so transcendent as to be incapable of coming in direct contact with finite and contingent beings, and that for this reason they attributed these appearances to the Son. However there does not seem to be much

[40] Adv. Graecos, 5.
[41] Ad Autolyc. 2, 22.
[42] Dial. 127.

force in this objection. For, in the first place, the Apologists hold that the Son is of the same substance as the Father, being not made,[43] but begotten,[44] alone God's own proper Son,[45] Himself God,[46] and one with the Father;[47] hence, logically at least, the Father cannot be more transcendent than the Son. In the next place, touching the Apologists' view concerning the transcendence of the Father, there seems to be a good deal of exaggeration in the works of modern critics. For if Theophilus could write: "Not only is it proper to the most high and omnipotent and true God to be everywhere, but also to see all things and to hear all things, although He cannot be contained in any place," [48] it would seem that his idea about the transcendence of God was very much the same as that of modern theologians.

Hence, taking it all in all, these alleged aberrations of the second-century Apologists appear to have no very solid foundation in fact. The terms used are not rarely inaccurate, and the ideas expressed by them may at times be hazy, but the doctrines thus imperfectly set forth seem at least to admit of an orthodox interpretation. Dogmatically it matters little what was really in the minds of these writers, as their tentative explanations of abstruse theological problems were merely the personal views of men who tried to give a rational setting to the truths of faith. If they erred in this, their error cannot be laid at the doors of the Church. But as a matter of historical interest, it is well to hear also the other side.[49]

Whilst the Apologists thus enlarge upon the divinity of the Son, and His relation to the Father, they say comparatively little about the Holy Ghost, contenting themselves with occasional statements of what is contained in Scriptural data. The reason of this difference of treatment arises, no doubt, from the general scope of their works; although Harnack contends that in their system of theology there was no room for the

[43] Athenag. Leg. pro Christ. 10.
[44] Ibid.; Justin, Dial. 61; Tatian, 5, 7.
[45] Justin, I Apol. 23; II Apol. 6.
[46] Justin, I Apol. 63.
[47] Athenag. o. c. 10.
[48] Ad Autolyc. 2, 3.
[49] Cfr. D'Alès, La Théologie de Tertullien, who gives a succinct but clear exposition of the points in question, pp. 84–96.

Holy Spirit. The truth is, that in reference to the Holy Spirit there was no immediate call for philosophical and theological discussions, and hence they said little about Him. Yet incidentally they refer to Him as the Holy Spirit, the Prophetic Spirit, the image and similitude of God, who with the Father and the Son is the author of creation, who is derived from the Father and was associated with the Son in the work of redemption.[50] Here and there they use comparisons that would seem to indicate only a modal distinction, but in other places they name Him with the Father and the Son as a third divine term in the Godhead, as will appear from the following paragraph.

The mystery of the Blessed Trinity is not explicitly discussed by the Apologists, yet on occasion they express their views in a manner which shows that they were well acquainted with the substance of the doctrine as it was formulated at a later date. Thus Theophilus states that the three days which preceded the creation of the light were an image of the Trinity, of God, His Word, and His Wisdom; understanding by Wisdom the Holy Spirit.[51] The doctrine was still more clearly expressed by Athenagoras, in his Apology to the Emperors. After showing that the Christians are not atheists, because they believe in a spiritual and immutable God, and in the Son of God, who is the Word of the Father, and in the Holy Ghost, who emanates from God as a ray of light from the sun, he concludes with the very pertinent question: "Who then would not be astonished to hear these men called atheists who proclaim a God the Father, a Son who is God, and a Holy Spirit; who show their power in the unity and their distinction by the rank?"[52] And in another paragraph of the same Apology he states: "The Christians know a God and His Word, what is the union of the Son with the Father, what is the communication of the Father with the Son, what is the union and the distinction of those who are thus united, the Spirit, the Son, the Father."[53] Almost the same terms

[50] Justin, Apol. I, 6; 13; Athenag. 10; 12; 24; Tatian, 7; 12; 13.
[51] Ad Autolyc. 2, 15.
[52] Supplic. 10.
[53] Ibid.

are used by St. Justin.[54] From this somewhat elementary statement of the doctrine to its formal definition not quite two centuries later, the cry is not so very far.

Of the other doctrines found in the Apologists a brief summary will suffice, as, with a few exceptions, they are but a restatement of what is contained in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers. The following points may be noticed:

1°. Jesus Christ, says Melito of Sardis, though God eternal, is also man; a perfect man, with a body and a soul like ours. He has two natures, and yet He is only one person.[55] This unity of person and distinction of natures is also brought out by St. Justin, when he says that Jesus Christ consists of a body, the Logos, and a soul.[56]

2°. The God-Man is not only our Redeemer, but He is so by a vicarious substitution: for all men were under a curse because of their sins, and hence the Father required that His Christ, who was without sin, should take upon Himself the malediction of us all. We were accursed and He suffered for us. In reference to the redemption He was the representative of the human race; in Him all mankind was included.[57]

3°. The first creatures of God are the angels, who were called into being before man. They were created intelligent and free, and made to serve God. They are God's ministers for the government of the world. Several of them sinned. The good angels are venerated by the faithful, but are not adored as God. The devil was the author of Adam's fall.[58]

4°. Man is defined by St. Justin as a "rational being composed of a body and a soul."[59] With this definition the others agree, all of them being dichotomists. They emphasize man's freedom of action, and point out that he was created to observe the law of justice and to fit himself for the blessedness of heaven. "God created men and angels free beings," writes Justin, "and according to His good pleasure deter-

[54] Apol. I, 13.
[55] Fragm. 6, 7, 8, 14, 15, 16.
[56] Apol. II, 10.
[57] Justin, Apol. I, 63; Dial. 41, 95, 115; Melito, fragm. 13.
[58] Justin, Dial. 88; Tatian, 7; Athenag. 10; Justin, Apol. II, 2, 5.
[59] De Resurrect. fragm. 24; Athenag. 10.

mined the time during which they should use their free will in observing the law of justice."[60] And again: "That every one shall be punished or rewarded according to his merits, we have been taught by the Prophets; and this we can show to be true. . . ." "For he (the just) would not be worthy of reward if he did not of himself choose what is good, but were predetermined thereto by nature; nor would the wicked be deserving of punishment, if they were not evil of their own free will."[61] Athenagoras calls attention to the ultimate end which God had in view in the creation of man. He did not create human beings for the advantage of other creatures, nor for His own advantage, but on account of Himself, "propter se," so that He might show forth His wisdom and goodness. Secondarily, however, man was created for his own happiness, that he might live forever.[62]

The natural immortality of man's soul is clearly taught by the unknown author of the Letter to Diognetus, who states that "the immortal soul dwells in a mortal body";[63] but it appears that this truth was denied, or at least called in question by some of the other Apologists. Thus Tatian and Theophilus point out that immortality is a reward granted to the just and a punishment inflicted on the wicked.[64] Justin apparently takes the same view, for he writes: "God alone, because unproduced, is not subject to corruption, and therefore He is God; but all other beings are produced and consequently under the law of corruption, and this is the reason why souls die and are punished."[65] And a little further on: "As man does not always exist, and the union between soul and body is not perpetual, but when the time comes that this harmony should be destroyed, the soul leaves the body and man ceases to be; so in like manner, when it behooves the soul no longer to exist, the vital spirit leaves it, and the soul ceases to be, and returns to the source whence it was drawn forth."[66] Some interpret this as simply a denial of essential immortality,

[60] Dial. 102.
[61] I Apol. 43.
[62] De Resurrect. Mort. 12.
[63] Ad Diognet. 7, 8.
[64] Tatian, 13; Theophil. 2, 19, 27.
[65] Dial. 5.
[66] Ibid. 6.

which can be predicated only of God; but that does not seem to be the author's meaning.

In connection with man's origin, the Apologists make several statements which may well be taken to imply their belief in original sin; although most modern critics are rather sceptical on this point. Thus St. Justin, without making any distinction between adults and children, states that baptism is a regeneration that frees the recipient from sin; also that the Son of God became man and was crucified for the human race, which had by Adam's fall come under the power of death and the deceits of the devil.[67] Tatian says that we are born to die, but we die through our own fault because we were sold through sin.[68] Theophilus teaches that all the labors and sorrows and afflictions of human life, and finally death, flow from Adam's sin as from a fountain of evil.[69] It is true, these and similar statements may, absolutely speaking, refer merely to the transmission of physical evils; but it is at least very probable that they also bear reference to the inheritance of moral guilt.

5°. Of the Church very little is said by the Apologists, as the scope of their work did not call for remarks on this subject; nevertheless St. Justin gives us an outline which it will be helpful to set down in this place. The Church, he says, has her origin in Christ, whose name she bears. She "has sprung from His name and partakes of His name."[70] Between Christ and His Church exists the most intimate relationship, much resembling that which results between man and woman when they are united in wedlock. "The marriages of Jacob were types of that which Christ was about to accomplish. For it was not lawful for Jacob to marry two sisters at once. And he served Laban for his daughters; and being deceived over the younger, he again served seven years. Now Leah," Justin tells Trypho, "is your people and synagogue; but Rachel is our Church."[71]

Hence the Church has taken the place of the synagogue, and

[67] I Apol. 61.
[68] Ad Græcos 11; cfr. 7.
[69] Ad Autolyc. 2, 25.
[70] Dial. 63.
[71] Ibid. 134.

the Christians are now the people of God, "a holy people."[72] For this reason no one is ever admitted into the Church unless he has accepted the Christian faith and is regenerated in the waters of baptism. "As many as are persuaded and believe that what we teach is true and are of a mind to live accordingly, are instructed to pray and to entreat God, with fasting, for the remission of their sins that are past, we praying and fasting with them."[73] Then "they are brought by us to a place where there is water and are regenerated in the same manner in which we were regenerated. For, in the name of God, the Father and the Lord of the universe, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit, they then receive the washing with water." And this is necessary; "for Christ also said, 'Except ye be born again, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.'"[74]

Hence baptism is a new birth, the beginning of a new life in the society of those whom God has chosen as His people. As members of this society the faithful must first of all be mindful of unity, since they constitute but one body. "Such a thing also you may witness in the body: although the members are numerated as many, all are called one and constitute a body. For, indeed, a people and a church, though consisting of many individuals in number, form a single entity and are spoken of and addressed by a single title."[75] Heresy, therefore, and schism are directly opposed to the fundamental idea of the Church, and those who are guilty of the one or the other are cut off from the fellowship of the faithful. There are many of this kind, as Christ Himself foretold that there would be. "Some are called Marcians, and some Valentinians, and some Basilidians, and some Saturnillians, and others by other names." "But with these we have nothing in common, since we know them to be atheists, impious, unrighteous and sinful, and confessors of Jesus only in name instead of being worshipers of Him."[76]

This unity of the Church is preserved by authorized teachers,

[72] Ibid. 119.
[73] I. Apol., 61
[74] Ibid.
[75] Dial. 42.
[76] Ibid. 35.

whose doctrine is in accordance with the Apostolic tradition. The Church teaches authoritatively as a mother teaches her children.[77] There is one who presides over the assembled faithful in each community, performs the liturgical services, instructs and exhorts the people, and has charge of the alms for the sick and the poor.[78] This, of course, is the bishop, although Justin does not call him by that name. Then there are also deacons, who distribute the consecrated elements to the faithful.

A further aid to the preservation of unity is the common worship in which the newly baptized immediately take part, and at which they must thereafter be present at stated times. "After we have thus washed him who has been convinced and has assented to our teaching, we bring him to the place where those who are called brethren are assembled, in order that we may offer hearty prayers in common, both for ourselves and for the baptized person and for all others in every place."[79] Then, "on the day called Sunday, all who live in the cities or in the country gather together in one place, and the memoirs of the Apostles or the writings of the Prophets are read as long as time permits; and when the reader has ceased, the president verbally instructs and exhorts to the imitation of these good things."[80]

"Next there is brought to the president of the brethren bread and a cup of wine mixed with water; and he, taking them, gives praise and glory to the Father of all, through the name of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, and offers thanks at considerable length for our being counted worthy to receive these things at His hands. When he has concluded the prayers and thanksgivings, all the people present express their assent by saying Amen. Then those among us who are called deacons take the bread and the wine mixed with water, over which the prayer of thanksgiving has been said, and distribute them to each one of those who are present, and also carry them to such as are absent."[81]

[77] De Resurrect. 5; Dial. 82.
[78] Apol. I, 65, 67.
[79] Ibid. 65.
[80] Ibid. 67.
[81] Ibid. 65.

"Now this food is called by us the Eucharist, of which no one is allowed to partake, except he has been baptized, believes what we teach, and observes the commandments of Christ. For not as common bread and common drink do we receive it; but in like manner as Jesus Christ our Saviour, having been made flesh by the word of God, hath taken both flesh and blood for our salvation, so likewise have we been taught that the food, which is blessed by the prayer of His word, and from which our flesh and blood by conversion are nourished, is the flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh. For the Apostles, in their commentaries which are called Gospels, have handed it down that Jesus had so commanded." [82]

Then follow the words of the institution, together with a brief reference to the cult of Mithra, in which, according to the author, the sacred mysteries are imitated through the instigation of the devil. In his Dialogue with Trypho, Justin points out that the prophecy of Malachy is verified in the Christian Eucharistic rite. The prophet, he says, "speaks of those Gentiles, namely us, who in every place offer sacrifice to God, that is the bread of the Eucharist and also the cup of the Eucharist." [83] And this is indeed a true sacrifice; for "we are the true high-priestly race of God, even as God Himself bears witness, saying that in every place among the Gentiles sacrifices are presented to Him, well-pleasing and pure. Now God receives sacrifices from no one except through His priests." [84]

Thus, then, the author gives us a fairly complete outline of the Church as a divine institution, of the baptismal rite, and of the Eucharistic worship. In regard to the latter he presents the doctrine of the Church with singular completeness, including the elements of the consecration, the change of these elements into the body and blood of Christ, the words by which the change is effected, the sacrificial character of the liturgical action, and, at least in a general way, the order of divine service on Sunday. Truly a precious heirloom of the distant past!

[82] Ibid. 66.
[83] Dial. 41.
[84] Ibid. 116.

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

6°. The same author gives also a beautiful summary of the Church's traditional teaching on Mary's position in reference to the redemption. "The First-Born of the Father before all creatures," he says, "became a man through the Virgin, that by what way the disobedience arising from the serpent had its beginning, by that way also it might have its undoing. For Eve, being a virgin and undefiled, conceiving the word that was from the serpent, brought forth disobedience and death; but the Virgin Mary, taking faith and joy, when the angel told her the glad tidings (of the Incarnation), answered: 'Let it be done unto me according to thy word.'"[85] Mary is pure and undefiled, as Eve was in the state of innocence, and by her obedience restored what had been ruined by the disobedience of Eve. This not only implies Mary's close association with the Redeemer in the work of our salvation, but also contains in its fundamental elements the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. The same comparison we shall find often repeated in subsequent writers.

7°. In their eschatological views the Apologists follow the traditional teaching of the Church, calling attention to the two advents of Christ, the one in the lowliness of the Incarnation, the other in glory at the end of time.[86] Justin, however, holds that there will be a Millennium, when the just shall reign with Christ for a thousand years.[87] Until the end of that time the beatific vision will be deferred, and hence after death even the souls of the just may in some way fall under the power of the demons, although not to their destruction. Still he admits that the hope of the Millennium is not shared by all.[88] In fact, the more common opinion is that there will be a general resurrection followed by the judgment, and then either heaven or hell according to each one's deserts. The material universe, which was created out of nothing, shall then perish in a general conflagration.[89]

These, then, are the principal points that strike one in study-

[85] Dial. 100.
[86] Justin, Apol. I, 52; Dial. 49; Tatian, 13; Theoph. 2, 14, 15.
[87] Dial. 80, 81.
[88] Ibid. 105.
[89] Justin, Dial. 45, 120; Apol. I, 8, 28; Tatian, 5; Ad Diognet. 10, 7.

ing the teaching of the Apologists. Do they bear the impress of secularizing Greek thought? Traces of a gradual secularization of the message of Christ? Indications of faith passing into doctrine, of evangelical freedom yielding to the restrictions of law? The answer to these questions may, of course, be made to depend on one's presuppositions. If one supposes that Christ taught no doctrines and enacted no laws, but gave to the world as His message solely the perfect life He led; then, yes, not only the Apologists, but every Christian teacher, from St. Peter and St. Paul onward, labored persistently at the Hellenization of the message of Christ. For they all used the principles of reason, mostly dressed in Hellenic garb, to preach Christ and to explain His sayings to the Gentile world. But who, with the Gospel records before him, would dare to make a supposition so startling? When Christ said: "Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven"; "unless you eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood, you shall not have life in you"; and so in a score of other instances, did He set forth no doctrines which His followers were called upon to believe? Why, then, did He say: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved: but he that believeth not, shall be condemned?"

Again, when He said: "He that heareth you, heareth me; he that despiseth you, despiseth me: whatsoever you shall bind upon earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed also in heaven; as the Father hath sent me, I also send you," did He establish no law or give no power to make laws according to the future needs of the Church? And if He did — if He did teach definite doctrines and did enact particular laws, either Himself or through others, why should not His followers apply the principles of sound philosophy, even though it was of Hellenic birth, to set forth more clearly the meaning of these doctrines and determine more exactly the force of these laws? To deny them this right, to bind them down to a parrotlike repetition of the Saviour's sayings, would be to stultify the Son of God

and bring to naught the work which His Father had given Him to do.

In this connection mention ought also to be made of a fragment from the writings of Hegesippus, the *Inscription of Abercius,* and the *Muratorian Canon.* They belong to the latter half of the second century and have considerable doctrinal value.

1°. Hegesippus, as Eusebius mentions in his Ecclesiastical History, was the author of a work in five books, which contained the true traditions of the Apostolic preaching. Apparently a native of Palestine, he traveled from church to church, in order, as he tells us, to ascertain the faith taught in each. The fragment in question contains his findings in the churches of Corinth and Rome. It reads thus: "And the church of the Corinthians remained in the true word until Primus was bishop of Corinth (that is, till the time of the author's visit). I made their acquaintance in my journey to Rome, and remained with the Corinthians many days, in which we were refreshed with the true word. And when I was in Rome, I drew up a list of succession as far as Anicetus, whose deacon was Eleutherius. And Soter succeeds Anicetus, after whom Eleutherius. And in each succession and in each city all is according to the ordinances of the law and the Prophets and the Lord." What a precious testimony to the unity of faith in those early days this is! And also to the mode of government in each church, and to the early Papal succession, as handed down by one who knew the condition of things from his own personal observation.

2°. Abercius was bishop of Hieropolis in Phrygia. About the middle of the second century he visited Rome, and on his return he composed an epitaph. Translated freely, it reads: "The citizen of a chosen city, this monument I made whilst still living, that there I might have in time a resting-place for my body; I being by name Abercius, the disciple of a holy shepherd, who feeds his flocks of sheep on mountains and plains, and who has great eyes that see everywhere. For this shepherd taught me that the Book of Life is worthy of

belief. And to Rome he sent me to contemplate majesty, and to see a queen golden-robed and golden-sandalled; there also I saw a people having a shining mark. And I saw the land of Syria and all its cities. Nisibis I saw, when I passed over the Euphrates. But everywhere I had brethren. I had Paul. . . . (the last part of the sentence is missing). Faith everywhere led me forward, and everywhere provided as my food a fish of exceeding great size and perfect, which a holy virgin drew with her hands from a fountain — and this faith ever gives to its friends to eat; having also wine of great virtue, and giving it mingled with bread. These things I, Abercius, having been witness of them, ordered to be written here. Verily I was passing through my seventy-second year. He that discerneth these things, a fellow-believer, let him pray for Abercius. And no one shall place another grave over my grave; but if he do, he shall pay to the treasury of the Romans two thousand pieces of gold and to my good native city of Hieropolis one thousand pieces of gold."

This is only an inscription on the tomb of a second century Christian bishop, yet its few lines are crowded with information on matters of doctrine and religious practice. Baptism marks the Christian with a shining seal, the Church is spread everywhere, and everywhere its members are brethren. Rome is the place where "majesty" dwells; obviously a reference to the preëminence of that Church. Christians are the flock of Christ the Holy Shepherd, who bears witness that the contents of the Holy Books are true. Faith provides spiritual food, a large and perfect fish, the symbol of Christ, who is the Son of a Holy Virgin. Not all understand the meaning of this, but fellow-believers do; and for them it is meet to pray for the dead.

3°. The Muratorian Canon, so named from its discoverer, L. A. Muratori, contains the oldest known list of books making up the New Testament. The beginning is missing, and the first line of the preserved text refers to the second Gospel. Then are mentioned the third and fourth Gospels, of Luke and John respectively, the Acts of the Apostles, the First Epistle of St. John, thirteen Letters of St. Paul — two of which, one

to the Laodiceans and one to the Alexandrians, are rejected as spurious — the Epistle of Jude, two other Epistles of St. John, his Apocalypse, and the Apocalypse of St. Peter. All these, with the two exceptions indicated above, are acknowledged as canonical; whilst the Shepherd of Hermas and a number of Gnostic and Montanistic writings are rejected. The Shepherd, however, may be read, but not publicly in the church. Likewise the Apocalypse of St. Peter is not universally received. Of our canonical New Testament books the two Epistles of St. Peter, the Epistle of St. James, and the Letter to the Hebrews, are not mentioned; yet the value of the document consists not so much in the completeness of the list of books it contains, but rather in the statement that the books there enumerated are received as genuine in the "Catholic Church." Practically, therefore, some fifty years after the death of St. John, the canon of New Testament writings was fixed.

CHAPTER VIII

THE TEACHING OF ST. IRENÆUS AND ST. HIPPOLYTUS[1]

St. Irenæus is usually associated with a group of writers called Antignostics. This title is applied to them because of their strenuous opposition to the Gnostic heresy, which they regarded as a special menace to the Church. There was quite a large number of them, mostly Asiatics, but the works of nearly all have perished. Irenæus was a prolific writer, as is seen from the frequent references to his literary activity by ancient authors. He was, moreover, a man whose opinion was highly valued by his contemporaries and by those who came after him; but, as happened in the case of so many other great men in those early times, most of his literary productions have fallen a prey to the calamities of subsequent ages. Aside from a few fragments, only two of his works have come down to us. One is a small treatise preserved in an Armenian translation, only recently discovered, under the title, *Demonstration of Apostolic Preaching.* The other is his great work in five books, entitled, *Against Heresies.* The heresies in question refer chiefly to the different Gnostic systems, of which he appears to have had intimate and first-hand knowledge.

However, the scope of this great work is not limited to mere polemics. "Whilst refuting the Gnostic error, it expounds the theory of the Church and of her doctrinal functions with such fullness and firmness that the third book is a veritable treatise on the Church, and the oldest in existence." As a faithful follower of the Good Shepherd, to whom every

[1] Cfr. Dufourcq, Saint Irénée; Doellinger, Hippolytus and Callistus; Batiffol, Primitive Catholicism, 164–245;* Durell, The Historic Church, 202–253; Tixeront, H. D. I, 229–240; D'Alès, Théologie de Saint Hippolyte.

stray sheep is dear, Irenæus did not aim at discomfiting adversaries of the faith by holding up their false teaching to ridicule, but rather endeavored to open for them the way to the truth, by presenting a clear exposition of the traditional teaching of the Church. This is one of the reasons why it seems preferable, in our present inquiries, to study his teaching primarily in itself and only incidentally in its relation to Gnosticism. The other reason is that St. Irenæus stands at the parting of the ways. After his time, Eastern and Western theological thought tended in two divergent directions. Not that already at this early date the two great churches began to drift apart, owing to Eastern schismatic tendencies, for of that the first signs appeared only some two hundred years later; but circumstances of place and peculiarities of national character brought it about that East and West were thenceforth absorbed in trying to find solutions of widely different problems. The one speculative and the other practical, they went each their own way; although these ways, for all their divergence, were closely linked by the bonds of one and the same faith.

Irenæus was born in Asia Minor, sometime between 130 and 142, most likely at or near Smyrna. During his boyhood he often listened to St. Polycarp, for whom he professed great veneration in after years. When arrived at man's estate, he traveled westward, tarrying some time in Rome and finally taking up his permanent residence at Lyons in Gaul. In 177, during the persecution of Marcus Aurelius, he was already a priest and was made the bearer of a letter from the church of Lyons to the Pope, concerning matters connected with the Montanist heresy. Shortly after his return he was made bishop, succeeding Ponthinus, who had been martyred for the faith.

It was some years after his elevation to the episcopal see of Lyons that he took a leading part in the paschal controversy. Pope Victor I (189-198), according to a statement of Eusebius, threatened to excommunicate certain Asiatic bishops, who in spite of his admonition persisted in celebrating Easter on the " fourteenth day of the passover according to the Gos-

pel," instead of accommodating themselves to the Roman custom. Irenæus, "in the name of those brethren in Gaul over whom he presided, wrote an epistle, in which he maintains the duty of celebrating the mystery of the resurrection of our Lord only on the day of the Lord. He becomingly also admonishes Victor not to cut off whole churches of God, who observed the tradition of an ancient custom." "And this same Irenæus, as one whose character answered well to his name, being in this way a peacemaker, exhorted and negotiated such matters as these for the peace of the churches." [2]

From other sources also it appears that Irenæus was a holy man and a most zealous pastor. He converted a large number of the Gallic Celts to Christianity, and brought the church of Lyons to a very prosperous condition. It is commonly believed that he died a martyr's death.

In non-Catholic circles it is usually put down as an historic fact, that Irenæus of Lyons was largely responsible for the evolution of the early Church, conceived as a communion of brotherly love, into authoritative Catholicism as it finds its perfect expression in the Church of Rome to-day. He it was, they say, who put an end to the Gnostic and Montanist crisis, and must be considered as "the author of the theory of such victorious principles as the authority of the rule of faith, the authority of episcopal succession, the authority of the confederation of bishops." How very unhistorical this statement is, and how absolutely without any foundation in fact, has recently been exhaustively shown by Mgr. Batiffol, in his excellent work on Primitive Catholicism. Furthermore, a mere glance at the preceding chapters cannot fail to convince the reader that authoritative Catholicism is as old as Christianity itself. The author of the Didache, Clement of Rome, Ignatius of Antioch, did not less firmly insist upon submission of the faithful to their ecclesiastical rulers than does the bishop of Lyons. The only difference is, that circumstances forced Irenæus to bring out more clearly, than had been the case with his predecessors, the universal extent of this author-

[2] Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. 5, 24.

ity. But even in this he does not follow his own private notions; his constant appeal is to the traditions handed down since the time of the Apostles, and the facts of history bear out his appeal.

In making this appeal, Irenæus does not, in the first instance, have recourse to written tradition as contained in Holy Scripture; and he gives the reason. The Gnostics, when confronted with the written word, either claim, though foolishly, that they have a more perfect gospel of their own, or else they say that Catholics are too simple to understand the Gospel which they possess.[3] With such men one cannot argue, except by bringing before them the witness of the living Church. Incidentally, however, Irenæus bears witness to the reverence with which the Sacred Writings, of both the Old and the New Testament, were regarded by himself and his fellow-believers. They were dictated, he says, by the Word of God and His Spirit; and the four Gospels especially determine the faith and are the norm of truth.[4] His writings also show that the New Testament canon was already fixed in his day.

As, then, the heretics cannot be convinced by an appeal to Holy Scripture, because they either misinterpret it or oppose to it their own apocryphal gospels, he quotes against them the Rule of Faith, which every Christian receives at baptism, and which cannot be changed, although it can be more or less perfectly understood and explained.[5] "The Church," he says, "is indeed scattered over the whole world, extending even to the ends of the earth; but she has received from the Apostles and their disciples one and the same faith, to wit: In one God the Father Almighty, who made heaven and earth and the sea, and all that is contained therein; and in one Christ Jesus, the Son of God, who for our salvation became flesh; and in the Holy Ghost, who through the Prophets made known God's economy of salvation; and in the advent of the beloved Christ Jesus our Lord, His birth of the Virgin, His sufferings and resurrection, and His return from heaven in the glory of the Father, to restore all things and to raise all

[3] Adv. Hæres. 3, 1; 1, 20, 1; 3, 11, 7; 2, 10, 2, 3.

[4] Ibid. 2, 28, 2; 3, 1, 1; 3, 11, 8.

[5] Ibid. 1, 9, 4; 10, 3.

flesh from the grave, so that before Christ Jesus our Lord and God and Saviour and King, according to the good will of the invisible Father, every knee shall bend, of those in heaven and on earth and under the earth, and every tongue shall confess Him; (He shall come) to pass judgment upon all, condemning the spirits of wickedness, the disobedient and rebellious angels, as also the ungodly and unjust and evil-doers and blasphemers among men, to everlasting fire, and rewarding the just and godly, who have observed His commandments, whether from the beginning or since their conversion, with life and immortality and eternal glory." [6]

This is the faith into which the children of the Catholic Church are baptized, to this her converts must subscribe. In substance it is identical with the contents of the Apostolic Creed, although here and there the lines are somewhat extended. And who is at the back of this faith? Who preserves it and vouches for its truth? This the author tells us in the following paragraph. It is the living Church, whose very unity shows her to be the work of God.

"These glad tidings," he continues, "the Church has received, and this faith she preserves with great care, so that, although scattered all over the earth, her children seem to dwell in one and the same house: this all believe with such accord that one would think they had but one heart and one soul, and this she preaches and teaches and hands down in such oneness of doctrine as if she had but one mouth. For although there are many and diverse languages in the world, nevertheless the substance of tradition is everywhere the same. The churches in Germany do not teach a different doctrine from those in Spain or those among the Celts; nor is there any difference of teaching in the churches of the Orient, in Egypt and Lybia, and in those that were founded in the center of the world: but rather as the sun, which is the work of God, is one and the same in all parts of the universe, so likewise is the preaching of the truth, enlightening all men who are predestined to come to a knowledge thereof. And neither will he, among ecclesiastical superiors,

[6] Ibid. I, 10, 1.

who is powerful in speech say aught else . . . nor will he who is less gifted in preaching take aught away from tradition." [7]

Whilst the living Church is thus the guardian of truth, those upon whom in the Church this duty of watching over the purity of faith chiefly falls, and from whom, in consequence, the truth may be fully ascertained, are the bishops whose succession is legitimately derived from the Apostles. "All who have eyes to see," he declares, "can recognize this tradition in any one of the churches, and we can point out the succession of bishops from the Apostles to our own day." [8] This uninterrupted succession of bishops in the churches founded by the Apostles warrants the truth of their teaching; for "together with the episcopal succession they also received the unfailing charism of truth." [9] "However, as it would be too long to enumerate the episcopal lists of all the churches, there is one, very great, and most ancient and known to all, the church founded and established at Rome by two most glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul, whose tradition which it hath from the Apostles, and whose faith proclaimed unto men by a succession of bishops coming down even unto us, we point to, thereby confounding all those who in any way form undue assemblies, on account of either self-pleasing ways, or of vain glory, or of blindness and wrong opinion. For with this church, because of her higher authority, it is necessary that every church, that is, the faithful all the world over, should agree." [10]

Here, then, is the ultimate and all-sufficient criterion of orthodox teaching — agreement with the church of Rome. Apostolic succession is indeed under ordinary circumstances a sufficient warrant that the truth is taught in any given church; but instead of laboriously inquiring in each instance whether such succession can be established, it suffices to ascertain whether that particular church is in communion with Rome. That mere fact decides the question of orthodoxy. Does this mean, therefore, that the text sets forth the Primacy of

[7] Ibid. 1, 10, 2.
[8] Ibid. 3, 3, 1.
[9] Ibid. 4, 26, 2, 4, 5.
[10] Ibid. 3, 3, 2.

Rome in matters of faith? Such is the contention of Catholic scholars; and although Protestants usually attempt another interpretation, the obvious meaning of the text is that Rome holds a preëminence to which all Christianity must bow. Hence the strong expression: "Ad hanc Ecclesiam necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam"— it is a matter of necessity, of obligation, that every church resort to Rome in order to find the truth. Hence, too, the historical fact, that men interested in the true faith, as Polycarp, Justin, Tatian, Rhodon, Abercius, Irenæus, Hegesippus, Tertullian, Origen, and numerous others, wended their way Rome-wards; not to speak of heretics who also tried to win Rome over to their side, in order to impress the world with the truth of their doctrines. Even Harnack, speaking of Polycarp's visit to Anicetus, says very significantly: "It was not Anicetus who came to Polycarp, but Polycarp to Anicetus." [11]

After thus pointing out the authoritative position of the church of Rome, Irenæus gives the succession of bishops, from "the Blessed Apostles, who founded and builded the church," to Linus, Anencletus, Clement, Evaristus, Alexander, Sixtus, Telesphorus, Hyginus, Pius, Soter, and Eleutherius, then occupying the see. Under the guidance of these bishops, "the Tradition which is of the Apostles hath ever been preserved." The safeguarding of the truth in the Church is, furthermore, assured for all times; because the Church is assisted in her teaching by the Spirit of God. It is He who renews her preaching, even as an exquisite deposit preserved in a goodly vessel, which keeps the vessel itself from becoming old. "He is the gift conferred by God on His Church, just as God imparted to Adam, His creature, the breath of life, in order that it might vivify his members." Whoso, then, does not hasten to the Church, cannot possess the Spirit of God. "For where the Church is, there also is the Spirit of God; and where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church and all grace: but the Spirit is truth." [12]

[11] Dogmengeschichte, I, 488.

[12] Adv. Hæres. 3, 2, 1, 2.

Over against this unity of faith in the Church, and its unfailing transmission by a divinely constituted authority and the guiding influence of the Holy Spirit, Irenæus places the endless variations and contradictions of the Gnostics. Among them there is no standard of truth, and every one makes his own doctrine for himself; they resemble the pagan schools of philosophy. They are sophists forever doomed to variations of every sort, tossed about by the waves of their errors, having no rock whereon to rest their edifice: nothing but moving sand. Thus truth can no longer be recognized. For if to-day we must look for it in the system of Cerinthus, tomorrow in that of Valentinian, then in that of Basilides, or Marcion, all of which contradict one another, how shall we know the truth? Can any one imagine a truth that varies? [13]

Besides this rather full and explicit teaching on the Church and the Rule of Faith, which, however, has been cited only in part, St. Irenæus touches on nearly all points of doctrine taught by the Church. Yet for brevity's sake most of this may be omitted; for as he is very conservative, he rarely goes beyond his predecessors in the development of any particular doctrine. Still the following points ought to be noted:

1°. Arguing against the Gnostics, who ascribed the creation of the world to a demiurge, he insists that there is only one God, and that this God is Himself the Creator. He is the God of both the Old and the New Testament, the only God, holy, just, and merciful.[14]

2°. In answer to the Gnostics' contention that the supreme God, who is all-good, cannot be the author of evil, he points to the fact that whatever evil there is in the world has its origin in the abuse of man's freedom, whence also resulted the original fall. Of his very nature man is limited in perfection, and he must perfect himself by obedience.[15] Instead of doing this, Adam disobeyed, and in him the whole race was guilty of disobedience.[16] Here we have a rather clear statement of the doctrine of original sin, we too being "debtors to Him whose commandment also we transgressed

[13] Ibid. 3, 2, 1, 2.
[14] Ibid. 3, 24, 1; 2, 1, 1, 2.
[15] Ibid. 4, 37, 1–3.
[16] Ibid. 5, 16, 3.

originally." In this connection the author draws a rigorous parallel between Adam and Christ; through the one we fell and through the other we were raised to a new life. Elsewhere he draws a similar parallel between Eve and Mary, referring to the former as the cause of our death and to the latter as the source of salvation and our advocate.[17]

3°. Although there is only one God, the Father of all, still the Son is also true God, "God in a definite and absolute sense of the word." [18] "By the Son, therefore, who is in the Father, and hath in Him the Father, He WHO IS, is declared to be God; the Father bearing witness to the Son, and the Son announcing the Father." [19] Besides the Father and the Son there is also the Holy Ghost, who is eternal, the Wisdom of God, and His Image. He and the Son took part in the creation of man, and He dwells in our body as in His temple.[20]

4°. In his Christology and soteriology, both of which are rather fully developed, the author brings out clearly the union of the human and the divine in Christ. Precisely how this union is to be explained he does not know; but of the fact that there is a most intimate union he is certain. It was the Word of God, the Only-Begotten of the Father, our Lord Jesus Christ, who saved us: the Incarnate Word was suspended on the cross.[21] His very office of Redeemer required that He should be both God and man; so that He might mediate between heaven and earth, and conquer the devil justly.[22] He was man to be tempted, Word to be glorified.[23]

5°. Our spiritual regeneration is effected through baptism; therein we are born again and receive the Holy Ghost.[24] Baptism is also administered to little children.[25] Christians must share in the fruits of the redemption through faith in Jesus Christ. This faith, however, is not merely an assent of the mind, but also a fulfillment of the Lord's precepts.[26]

6°. The Holy Eucharist he clearly teaches to be the body

[17] Ibid. 3, 22, 4; 5, 19, 1.
[18] Ibid. 3, 6, 1, 2.
[19] Ibid. 3, 6, 2.
[20] Ibid. 5, 12, 2; 4, 7, 4; 4, 20, 1.
[21] Ibid. 3, 16, 9; 5, 18, 1.
[22] Ibid. 3, 18, 7; 5, 1, 1.
[23] Ibid. 3, 19, 2, 3.
[24] Ibid. 1, 21, 1; 3, 17, 2, 3.
[25] Ibid. 2, 22, 4.
[26] Ibid. 4, 2, 7; 4, 6, 5.

and blood of the Saviour, into which the bread and wine are changed by the invocation of God. Having established this, he draws from it an argument against the Gnostics, refuting their contentions that material creatures are evil, that God cannot have made them, and that the body shall not rise again. This argument presupposes that the Gnostics also admitted the Real Presence. "How," asks Irenæus, "can they be certain that the bread over which the Eucharistic words have been spoken is the Lord's body, and the chalice is His blood, if they confess not that He is the Son of the Creator, His Word, through whom the trees bear their fruit, the fountains gush forth, and the earth produces first the blade, then the ear, and then the full-grown wheat in the ear? How again do they say that our bodies shall be dissolved in corruption and not receive life, since they are nourished with the body and blood of the Lord? Therefore let them either change their mind or abstain from making the aforesaid oblation." [27] Catholics, on the other hand, are perfectly consistent, believing as they do in the Real Presence and in the resurrection of the body. "For even as the bread, which is of the earth, is no longer common bread after receiving the invocation of God, but the Eucharist, consisting of two elements, the one earthly and the other heavenly; so in a similar manner our bodies receiving the Eucharist are no longer corruptible, but have the hope of a future resurrection." [28]

Hence not only Catholics, but Gnostics as well, firmly believed in the Real Presence, although these latter distorted the doctrine to suit their own peculiar tenets. The same must be said about the Eucharist as a true sacrifice, since from this aspect, also accepted by the Gnostics, Irenæus proves to them that matter cannot be evil, because bread and wine, the elements of consecration, are material creatures.[29] In connection with this he reminds them that the Eucharist is the clean oblation spoken of by the Prophet Malachy, and that the Apostles, following the Master's direction, caused it to be offered throughout the world.[30]

[27] Ibid. 4, 18, 4; cfr. 5, 2, 2.
[28] Ibid. 4, 18, 5.
[29] Ibid. 4, 18, 5.
[30] Ibid. 4, 17, 5.

7°. Penance restores the truly repentant to peace, to the friendship of God, and to communion. Incidentally the author also refers to public penance and to confession, but he gives no particulars. The heretic Cerdon, he says in one place, did public penance before the Church during the pontificate of Hyginus;[31] and in another place he relates how at Lyons in Gaul certain women, who had been seduced by the Gnostics, despaired of salvation, because they were ashamed to confess their sins, whilst others who had committed the same sin did penance and were restored to communion.[32]

8°. The author's eschatological views are somewhat peculiar. He holds that the soul of Christ had to remain in limbo until the third day when He rose from the dead, and so must also the souls of the just remain in an invisible place until they shall be reunited to their bodies.[33] There will be first a resurrection of the just alone, who are to reign with Jesus Christ during a thousand years and enjoy all the blessings of the Millennium.[34] He admits indeed that others do not believe in this doctrine, but with them he has little patience. Then, after the thousand years have come to an end, the general resurrection and the judgment will take place.[35] The punishment of the wicked, as well as the reward of the just, shall be everlasting.[36]

Thus with the exception of a few minor points, concerning which he gives his own personal views, the author's exposition of Catholic doctrine is most satisfactory. His claim that he is guided by the tradition of the Apostles is borne out by almost every statement contained in his great work. And his witness to this tradition is all the more important as he knew from his own personal experience what was the teaching of the different churches on the points in question. Educated in Asia Minor, visiting Rome on several occasions, the chief pastor of Christianity in Gaul, he came during his life in contact with representative Christians from all over the world, and among them not a few whose memories, like his own, reached

[31] Ibid. 3, 4, 3.
[32] Ibid. 1, 6, 3; 1, 13, 7.
[33] Ibid. 5, 31, 2.
[34] Ibid. 5, 32–35.
[35] Ibid. 2, 33, 5; 5, 32, 1.
[36] Ibid. 4, 28, 2; 5, 36, 2.

back to the time of the Apostolic Fathers. A better witness to Apostolic tradition could hardly be found.

By way of supplement to the teaching of St. Irenæus, a few remarks may here be made about the doctrinal views of Hippolytus of Rome, who, according to Photius (Bibl. cod. 121), was a disciple of the bishop of Lyons towards the end of the second century. He was an exegete rather than a theologian, still his occasional observations on dogmatic points are of considerable value, especially as they record the views then entertained in the capital city of Christendom. He was a voluminous writer, but most of his works have perished. Of the eighteen books mentioned by St. Jerome, only two are complete, the treatise *Contra Noetum* and the *Philosophumena*. This latter, which is a refutation of various heresies, was for a long time ascribed to some unknown author of the third century, but it is now commonly admitted to be the work of Hippolytus. The teaching of this disciple of Irenæus, as gathered from the above-mentioned two works and from fragments of his other books, may be briefly summarized as follows:

1°. "God is one, first and alone, the Creator and Lord of all things, without anything coeval with Himself." [37] "There was nothing besides Himself; He was alone, and yet He was manifold. For He was not without His Word, without wisdom, without power, without counsel. All these were in Him: He Himself was all. When He willed, and as He willed, He manifested the Word at a time determined by Himself: through the Word He made all things." [38] "Of all beings the Word alone was generated by Him." [39] "His Word is from Himself; therefore also God, since He is the substance of God." [40]

"And thus there was present with Him another one. But when I say another, I do not say two gods; but the Word proceeded from Him as light from light, as water from a fountain, as a ray from the sun. For there is one power which proceeds from the whole; but the whole is the Father

[37] Philosoph. 10, 32.
[38] Cont. Noet. 10.
[39] Philosoph. 10, 33.
[40] Ibid.

and the power proceeding from the whole is the Word." [41] "Christ is God over all things." [42]

All this is rather archaic, as far as the expressions go, but the doctrine is perfectly clear and orthodox. The author has no doubt whatever about the oneness of God, the true divinity of the Word, and the consubstantiality of the Word with the Father. However, he is less satisfactory when he comes to speak of the Word's divine sonship, as a few citations will show.

2°. "What manner of Son did God send into the world through the Incarnation, except His Word, whom He called Son in view of His future birth? And when He is called Son, it is because of His love towards men. For the Word, apart from the flesh and in Himself, was not truly Son, although He was truly the only-begotten Word." [43] Hence the divine sonship of the Word seems to depend, at least for its perfection, on the Incarnation. However, in this there appears to be a question of the name rather than of the underlying reality; for the Word was born of the Father before the creation of the world, and was even then His Son.

3°. The Word Incarnate is both perfect God and perfect man. The union between the human and the divine is so intimate that without the Word the human nature could not exist. "Neither could the flesh exist by itself and without the Word; for it has its subsistence in the Word." [44] On the other hand, the human nature was not merged into the divinity; for "we must believe that God the Word descended from heaven into the holy Virgin Mary, so that He might become Incarnate in her, taking a rational soul and being made in all things like unto us, sin alone excepted." [45] Even as man He "is one Son of God," yet at the same time both God and man. Hence the unity of person and the distinction of the two natures in Christ is clearly maintained by the author.

4°. The personal distinction of the Holy Ghost is hardly touched upon by Hippolytus; but this is easily explained, as

[41] Cont. Noet. 11.
[42] Philosoph. 10, 34.
[43] Cont. Noet. 15.
[44] Ibid.
[45] Ibid. 17.

the works that have come down to us are almost entirely controversial, and the controversy was not about the Holy Ghost but about the Son. Incidentally, however, the Holy Spirit is represented as one of the Trinity, being associated with the Father and the Son in the same Godhead.[46]

5°. "God the Word became man that He might save him who had fallen, and bestow immortality upon all those who would believe in His name."[47] The Incarnate Word is the new man, in whom the old Adam is restored to newness of life.[48] By His sufferings and death He paid our ransom and merited for us a title to incorruptibility and glory.[49]

6°. Of the Church the author speaks only in passing, but he bears witness to the fact that she was then called Catholic in opposition to heretical sects. She is the gathering of the saints, the assemblage of the faithful who live in justice. To be a true member thereof one must have practical faith, which shows itself in the observance of God's commandments.[50]

7°. Entrance into the Church is through baptism, which effects the forgiveness of sins and a spiritual regeneration.[51] The newly baptized are confirmed, and thus receive the Holy Spirit.[52] The faithful are nourished with the flesh and blood of the Saviour, which is offered in every place and among all nations as the great sacrifice of the New Law.[53] To the Church has been entrusted the power of forgiving sins committed after baptism, but there are some grievous offenses which she should not pardon.[54] It was on account of this rigorism that the author was so bitterly opposed to Pope Callistus, on which point something will be said in another chapter. Holy orders are also referred to, and the observance of celibacy on the part of the clergy is strongly insisted on.

8°. God created the world out of nothing, and all that He made was good. Man was created immortal, but after the primal transgression, and because of it, death and corruption are the common lot of all.[55] However, there will be a resur-

[46] Ibid. 8, 14; 8. 12.
[47] Ibid. 17.
[48] De Christo et Antichristo, 26.
[49] Cont. Noet. 17, 18.
[50] In Dan. 1, 17, 5–14.
[51] Ibid. 1, 16, 2, 2.
[52] Ibid. 1, 16, 3.
[53] In Gen. 49, 20; 38, 19.
[54] Philosoph. 9, 12.
[55] Ibid. 10, 33; In Gen. 38, 19.

rection of the dead, when each soul shall be reunited to her own body. The bodies of the just shall be changed so as to be a source of happiness to the soul, whereas those of the wicked shall ever remain subject to all the infirmities of this life. After the resurrection comes the judgment, over which the Incarnate Word of God will preside. All the world, angels, men, and demons, will acclaim the judgment to be just. Then every one shall receive the reward of his deeds. Those who have led good lives shall be recompensed with eternal happiness, whilst evil-doers shall be condemned to everlasting punishment. This punishment of the wicked consists in tortures of both soul and body. The end of the world is near at hand.[56]

Gathering up what has been said in three of the foregoing chapters — that on the Apostolic Fathers, on the Apologists, and on St. Irenæus and St. Hippolytus — we have a fairly complete view of Christian teaching during the second century. Nearly every point of doctrine is touched upon, and some of the more fundamental articles of our holy faith are stated with great clearness. Of doctrinal development, however, there occur as yet only a few noticeable traces. They are mostly found in matters connected with ecclesiology, the relation of the Word to the Father, the unity of person and duality of nature in the God-Man, the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the Blessed Sacrament, and the sacrificial character of the Eucharistic rite. As a general rule no theories are advanced, but the facts of faith are definitely stated. It is these facts that form the foundation of latter theories, which in their turn lead to a fuller exposition of the very same facts, and thereby advance the development of dogmas.

[56] Adv. Graecos, 2; 3; Philosoph. 10, 9, 34; 10, 34; In Proverb. 11, 30.

CHAPTER IX

MONARCHIAN AGITATIONS AND MONTANIST EXCESSES[1]

Gnostic speculations not only occasioned heavy attacks among orthodox Christians in defense of the faith, but they made so profound and enduring an impression on certain anxious souls that a reaction set in which led to opposite extremes. The fundamental doctrine of Gnosticism logically implied a division of the Godhead, defining as to God a *pleroma* of divine beings, all indeed subordinated to the Father-God, yet directly or indirectly emanating from him by some sort of generation, and therefore of necessity sharing his nature, although not by way of identity. It was these inferior divinities that were according to Gnostic speculations, concerned with the visible world, while the supreme God stood aloof in majestic isolation. All this was so foreign to Christian consciousness, and appeared so radically opposed to the faith handed down by the Apostles, that many thought it necessary to place exclusive emphasis on the "sole and independent and absolute existence and being and rule of God." This concept of one God and one divine economy, in contradistinction to the Gnostic *pleroma* and its fanciful relation to the visible world, formed the root idea of a movement of thought usually designated as Monarchianism. The following is a brief outline of its genesis and teachings, to which may be added a few words about the rise and excesses of Montanism.

A — Adoptianism and Modalism

In its original intent and purpose, therefore, Monarchianism was neither more nor less than an orthodox reaction against

[1] Cfr. Tixeront, H. D. I, 287–298; Shahan, The Early History of the Trinity, H. D. I, 148–161; *Bethune-Baker, Early History of Christian Doctrine, I, 210 ff.; Bethune-Baker, Op. cit. 96–113; Loofs-Ayer, Art. Monarchianism, Enc. Brit. XI, 497–505.

the unbridled license of Gnostic speculations. But before long it took a different turn and advanced views that were plainly out of harmony with the traditional teaching of the Church. Orthodox Christianity insisted indeed upon the unity of God and upon a strictly divine government of the world, but it insisted also upon the true divinity of the Son and upon His share in the "rule of God." These two beliefs must be reconciled, yet so as not to alter the traditions that had come down from the Apostolic past. This Monarchianism failed to do, and hence its final defection from the faith.

Thus it was the true divinity of the Son that proved a stumbling-block to the defenders of the Monarchy, although not in the same way to all. At an early date two parties were formed, each one offering its own solution of the problem. The one reduced the divinity of Christ to a mere power bestowed on Him by God, by the right use of which He acquired divinity in a relative and moral sense; whilst the other, maintaining that Jesus was truly God, merged His divinity so completely into that of the Father as to deny that the Son was a distinct person. The chief representatives of the former class were Theodotus, Artemon, and Paul of Samosata; of the latter, Praxeas, Noetus, and Sabellius. The former are also known to history as Adoptionists and Dynamic Monarchians, whilst the latter are called Modalists, Patripassianists, and Sabellians.

1°. Dynamic Monarchianism is usually traced back to Theodotus, a currier of Byzantium, who, during the last decade of the second century, came to Rome and was excommunicated by Pope Victor. He seems, however, to have been impelled by the desire to save his own reputation rather than by zeal for the unity of God. Accused of having denied Christ during the late persecution, he admitted the fact but pleaded as an excuse that thereby he had not denied God, since Christ was only man. When he was called to account for this statement, he persisted in his assertion that Jesus was merely human, an ordinary man born of a virgin, to whom the power of God was communicated in a singular manner. This led to his excommunication, and thereupon he founded a sect of

his own. His immediate followers, however, seem to have taken little interest in religious discussions. They were for the most part literary men, who preferred to busy themselves with the study of ancient authors and the grammatical exegesis of Holy Scripture. The best known of them is another Theodotus, called the banker, who placed Melchisedech above Jesus and thus gave rise to the sect of Melchisedechians.

Somewhat later a certain Artemon or Artemas, a Syrian by birth, tried to prove these new views by an appeal to Scripture and tradition, but his arguments were thoroughly refuted by the unknown author of the *Little Labyrinth,* who had no difficulty in showing that Christ had from the very first been regarded and worshiped as true God. After this the sect began to dwindle away, although remnants of it were still found at the time of St. Augustine. In Syria, however, it experienced a brief revival shortly after the middle of the third century, through the efforts of Paul of Samosata, bishop of Antioch and chancellor of Queen Zenobia. He contended that the Logos was indeed *homoousios* or consubstantial with the Father but only modally distinct, and that He dwelt in Jesus not essentially or personally, but merely as an attribute or quality. Hence in Paul's view the unity of God implies oneness of person as well as of nature; the Word and the Holy Spirit being simply impersonal attributes of the Godhead. He was condemned by three successive provincial synods and finally deposed through the intervention of the Emperor Aurelian, who, though a pagan, decided that the episcopal dignity and jurisdiction ought to be given to a person in communion with the Bishop of Rome.

2°. Modalistic Monarchianism started out with a fairer promise of success. For not only did it uphold the unity of God, but also the true divinity of Christ. It did this indeed by removing the real distinction between the persons of the Father and the Son, but this heterodox proceeding was not so apparent to the unsuspecting faithful. In reference to the divine persons the doctrine was identical with that of Paul of Samosata, but as its defenders insisted that Christ was truly divine, its heretical element was not easily recognized.

Hence for some time this new heresy escaped even the vigilance of Pope Zephyrinus; but under his successor, Callistus, its true nature was discovered, and its abettors were promptly excommunicated.

Tertullian connects the origin of this sect with a certain Praxeas, of whom nothing further is known than that he lodged a complaint against the Montanists at Rome, and then passed over into Africa, where he propagated his Modalistic views. He was convicted of heresy by Tertullian and made to sign a retractation. Hippolytus, on the other hand, states that Modalism was first taught by Noetus of Smyrna in Asia Minor, who was excommunicated by the presbyterium of that city. At all events, both were active in spreading the same error, Praxeas in Africa and Noetus in Asia Minor.

A somewhat modified form of Modalism was brought to Rome by Epigonus, early in the third century. There it found an ardent propagandist in the person of Cleomenes, and a little later in that of Sabellius. From this latter the heresy received the name of Sabellianism, by which it was known in the East; whilst in the West it was commonly called Patripassianism, in allusion to the fundamental doctrine advanced by these Modalists. According to them it was the Father Himself, under the name of Son, who became incarnate in Jesus and suffered for the salvation of the world. As strict Monarchists they admitted a trinity of manifestations, but not a trinity of persons. Father, Son and Holy Spirit, they said, are simply designations of three different phases under which the one divine essence reveals itself; three distinct names of one identical nature and person. Sabellius indeed, when occasion required, would speak of three divine persons, but only in the original sense of the word, signifying a rôle of acting or mode of manifestation. Patripassianism survived till the fifth century, and played a considerable part in the theological discussions that followed the Council of Nicæa.

B — Montanistic Excesses

Montanism was in no sense an Antignostic reaction, but it appears preferable to call attention to it in this place on account

of the baleful influence it exerted over Tertullian, of whom we must speak in the next chapter. In its beginnings the Montanistic movement did little more than overemphasize the influence which was traditionally attributed to the Holy Spirit, in reference to the special illumination of certain chosen individuals among the faithful. The gift of prophecy played a rather prominent part in the early Church, and authentic instances of this gift reached well up into the second century. Hence when Montanus, a Phrygian convert, began to attract attention by ecstasies and transports in which he uttered strange sayings, it was not at all surprising that he should pass for a prophet. And when two women, Prisca and Maximilla, developed the same symptoms, they were readily accepted as prophetesses. And so the movement was started, probably about 170.

In their first message from the Paraclete they announced that the Saviour would speedily return, and that the "Vision of the Heavenly Jerusalem" would soon appear on earth, at a spot which they indicated. The result, of course, was immediate and wide-spread social disorder. Earthly interests were entirely set aside, and people devoted themselves exclusively to the practice of asceticism, so as to be prepared for the expected advent of the great day. Thus started, the movement spread rapidly and sowed discord on all sides. At first the authorities of the Church adopted a waiting policy, hoping that the excitement would gradually spend itself; but when matters were going from bad to worse, a number of synods were held in Asia Minor, and finally the followers of the new prophet were excommunicated. At the same time several eminent writers, among them Apollinaris of Hierapolis and Serapion of Antioch, refuted the claims of these pretenders. But neither ecclesiastical censures nor polemical attacks had any appreciable effect towards checking the movement.

From Asia the followers of the prophet carried his message into Gaul, Italy, and Africa. In this latter country their most distinguished convert was Tertullian, a priest of Carthage, who since his conversion to Christianity, some fifteen years before, had done yeoman's service in the cause of faith.

His acceptance of the Montanists' pretensions meant a break with the Church, but his passionate nature did not shrink from so momentous a step. To his mind the movement did not endanger the faith, but rather confirm it; and so he threw all other considerations to the winds. Its asceticism especially had great attraction for him, and so had also certain rigoristic views regarding marriage and other points of doctrine. The Montanists of Africa chose him as their head, and even called themselves Tertullianists in his honor. However, in the West the movement did not prove very successful, whilst in the East it continued to make considerable stir till the fifth century. After that time it gradually disappeared.

As a doctrinal movement Montanism amounted to very little. Its Millenarian views were, in substance, shared by some orthodox Christians, among them men of eminence, like St. Justin and St. Irenæus. In asceticism it went somewhat to extremes, but its worst features resulted from doctrinal rigorism, especially touching remarriage and the forgiveness of certain sins. To these must be added its decided opposition to Church authority. It was principally these points that proved the undoing of Tertullian.

By way of reaction against Montanism another sect sprang up in the latter part of the second century, whose members are known as the Alogi. They rejected the Gospel and Apocalypse of St. John, presumably because in them the doctrine of the Holy Ghost holds a prominent place. In consequence they also rejected the Logos doctrine, and on account of this their adversaries, by a play on words, called them Alogi, that is, men without reason. It is usually held that they were the forerunners of Monarchianism, but little is known of their history.

CHAPTER X

SOME WESTERN THEOLOGIANS AND THE BEGINNINGS OF LATIN THEOLOGY[1]

St. Irenæus, though belonging to the East by birth and training, may nevertheless be said to have laid the foundation of Western theology. Conservative and practical, tenaciously clinging to the traditions of the past and yet solicitously attentive to the needs of the present, he exerted in far-away Gaul an influence that was felt in all Western lands, and impressed upon Latin theological thought and tendencies a sane conservatism which formed its most striking characteristic for many centuries. And yet in the initial efforts of building on this solid foundation, two men were chiefly concerned who both fell away from the Church; but it must be noted that their aberrations were to a great extent the outcome of their personal predispositions. These two men were Tertullian and Novatian. Both of them were gifted with more than ordinary intellectual powers, but unfortunately neither had that self-control, disinterestedness, and well balanced judgment, which are the first requisites in solving practical theological problems. Hence at the critical moment, when they should have set their personal views entirely aside, they were found wanting.

With these two may be associated a third writer of the same period, although he was more distinguished for his pastoral zeal than for his theological ability. This is Cyprian, the saintly bishop of Carthage. He professed to be a disciple of Tertullian, and in many instances he did little more than give

[1] Cfr. D'Alès, La Théologie de Tertullien; Leclercq, L'Afrique Chrétienne, I; Bardenhewer, Altkirch. Lit. II, 332–394; 394–464; Batiffol, Primitive Catholicism, 264–281; 332–402; Tixeront, H. D. I, 298–366.

to his master's speculations a practical turn. The works of these men represent in some way the beginning of Latin theology, differing from previous productions along theological lines both in language and in thought. Only a brief outline can here be given, but it will be sufficient for our purpose.

A — Tertullian: His Trinitarian and Christological Teaching

Quintus Septimius Florens Tertullianus was the son of a Roman centurion, resident at Carthage in Africa. In his early years he received a thorough training in Latin and Greek literature. Later on he took up the practice of law, and in a short time became a distinguished man. However, like the majority of educated pagans, he was steeped in worldliness and appears to have led a rather licentious life. Struck by the constancy with which Christians endured torture and death for their faith, he began to inquire into the claims of Christianity, and about 196 was received into the Church. A few years later he was admitted to the presbyterium at Carthage, where he gained universal respect as a fervent priest. His greatest failings were his violent temper and a decided leaning towards excessive rigorism. It was on account of this latter disposition that after some years he felt himself growing out of harmony with the Catholic spirit. Hence when in 207 the Montanists became very active at Carthage, he began to look for a realization of his ascetic ideals in their ranks. Still it was not until 213 that he definitely broke with the Church and became a full-fledged Montanist. He lived to a decrepit old age, but, as far as is known, he never renounced his error.

During more than twenty years, from 197 to 220, Tertullian was constantly writing against all manner of adversaries, and most of his works have come down to us, though not always in well preserved form. They are of very unequal value, and even the best of them must be read with discrimination. The chief reason is that they are nearly all polemical, and in the heat of combat Tertullian thought more of crushing his adversary than of setting forth the exact truth.

According to Harnack, Tertullian was the founder of

Western Christianity in its present form and the father of orthodox Trinitarian and Christological belief; an assertion, remarks Bardenhewer, that goes far beyond the worst exaggeration of which Tertullian himself, even in his wildest moods, was ever found guilty.[2] The fact is that Tertullian did little more than clear up hazy concepts and forge a new theological language. He did not add to the contents of Christian teaching as it existed before his time, nor did he divert theological thought from its accustomed trend; but he gathered up many a vague idea thus far imperfectly conceived, pointed out with legal accuracy its true significance, and coined the precise term that would best convey its meaning to others. He did not create a new theology, but a new theological language. Till his time the only theological language of the West as well as the East was Greek. Even Hippolytus, though a Roman, employed the Greek language exclusively in the composition of his many works. It may indeed be said that Tertullian's theology differed also in thought from that of his predecessors, but this difference is in the form only, not in the contents. Thus he was truly a pioneer, the founder of Western theology; but not in the sense claimed by Harnack. He created the outward form of theology as distinct from Christian doctrine, and provided the proper terms for the exact expression of theological thought, but the spirit that gave it life flowed from the fountain of Apostolic preaching.

And this he himself insisted on from the moment he took up his pen in defense of the faith until it fell from his palsied hand after his defection from the Church. In one sense it may be said that it was precisely his theological conservatism that finally led him astray. His was too rigid a character to bend to the exigencies of the times, even where it could be done without sacrifice of principle or truth. In all his writings he appeals to the traditions of the past. "No one," he says in the *De Præscriptione,* "knows the Father except the Son, and he to whom the Son has revealed Him; and to no others did the Son reveal Him except to the Apostles whom He sent out to preach what He had revealed. Now what

[2] Altkirch. Litt. II, 340.

they preached, that is, what Christ revealed to them, ought to be ascertained from the churches which they founded."[3] From the teaching of the mother-churches there is no appeal, even to the Scriptures; for the Scriptures belong not to heretics, but to the Church: she is their guardian and interpreter. This is the law of prescription which closes all further appeal.

For practical purposes the teaching of the Church is summed up in the Symbol, the *Lex Fidei,* as the author calls it in his legal phraseology. This Symbol, unlike matters that are merely of discipline and custom, cannot be touched; a view evidently borrowed from Irenæus. Even as a Montanist he clung to this principle. Only what lies outside the Symbol and at the same time is not clearly contained in the teaching of the Church, may be made a matter of investigation.[4] The Symbol of the African Church has been received from the mother-church at Rome; the latter, therefore, is the fountain of truth.[5] In all this there is evidently no attempt to strike out into new directions; the author closely follows the lines traced out by Irenæus, Justin, and the Fathers of the sub-Apostolic age.

With this ascertained, we may now examine a few points of doctrine, in which we shall indeed find new modes of presentation, but nothing new by way of contents.

1°. God is strictly one, yet in such wise that in the one God there are three divine persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, who are distinct in their personality but identical in substance.[6] This oneness of the Godhead admits of a certain *oikonomia,* a distribution of the unity into the Trinity, which does not destroy but organize the Monarchy.[7] The result of this distribution of the unity of the Godhead is the trinity of persons, through a communication of the same nature, the same substance, and the same power to each. "The Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Spirit is God, each of the three is God."[8] Though one, they are three; they are not "unus"

[3] Op. cit. 21; cfr. 19.
[4] De Praescript. 13; 14; De Virgin. Veland. 1.
[5] De Praescript. 21.
[6] Adv. Prax. 2; 4; 8.
[7] Ibid. 2.
[8] Ibid. 13.

but "unum," not one person but one nature; "tres personæ, una substantia," three persons, one substance; "trinitas unius divinitatis, Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus," a trinity of one divinity, the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost.[9]

These expressions, "one substance, one state, three persons, a trinity of one divinity," are new theological terms; they are coined by one who has apparently a clear concept of what he believes and a thorough grasp on the genius of the language he uses; but there is absolutely nothing new in the ideas which they convey. The first three, it is sometimes contended, were borrowed from the legal language of the day and made to fit floating concepts of the faith; but if so, they acquired in this transference from one sphere of thought to another a new significance. They did not determine the author's thought, but the author's thought determined their meaning in the new usage which he thus inaugurated. And in this new usage he enshrined the faith as preached by the Apostles. For, after all his dexterous efforts to set forth in apt definition the teaching of the Church on the Trinity, after all the various turns of speech he employs to mark plurality of persons and identity of substance or nature, he falls back for the doctrine itself upon the words of the Saviour recorded in St. John, "Ego et Pater unum sumus." This contains the sum and substance, the very essence of his teaching. "Non unus sed unum," not identity of person but identity of nature. The new theological terminology which he thus originated became a precious heirloom for subsequent ages, but only in so far as it enshrined the more precious heritage of Apostolic preaching.

It must, however, be observed that whilst the author's terminology is almost Nicene in its exactness, and whilst in his mere statement of the Trinitarian doctrine he rivals the great Fathers of the fourth century, he is far from being satisfactory when he enters upon detailed explanations of his views. Even if Harnack's inference that Tertullian was in reality a Tritheist[10] goes somewhat beyond the premises, nevertheless there is found in his writings a large number of texts

[9] Ibid. 22; De Pudic. 21.

[10] Dogmengeschichte, I, 575 sqq.

that seem to point in this direction. Thus when he states that the three divine persons do not differ in nature, in substance, in power, he adds that they do differ "gradu, forma, specie," and although the exact meaning of these terms is not quite clear, not a few writers are inclined to see in them more than a merely personal distinction.[11] Again, speaking of the Father and the Son, he says: "The Father is the whole substance, but the Son is a derivation of the whole and a portion, as He Himself acknowledges when he states, 'The Father is greater than I.'"[12] Hence the Father is invisible "pro plenitudine majestatis," whilst the Son is visible "pro modulo derivationis," and "pro temperatura portionis."[13] Similarly the Holy Spirit, who comes from the Father through the Son, "a Patre per Filium," is, as the "vicaria vis" of the Son, in a like subordinate position to the Father, although He is the same God with the Father and the Son.[14]

To some extent, no doubt, these and similar Subordinationist expressions may be accounted for by the author's anxiety to refute at all costs the views of Praxeas, who rejected the traditional teaching concerning the personal distinctions in the Godhead. Hence this distinction is very much emphasized, and then to preserve in spite of it the oneness of God, the Son and the Holy Spirit are conceived as in some way subordinate to the Father. There is obviously a flaw in this reasoning, at least as it is proposed by the author; but not to the extent, as Harnack maintains, that the unity of the divine substance is conceived as merely specific or generic. In the author's mind it is numerical and absolute; for he emphasizes again and again that the distinction of persons arises from a distribution of the unity, not from a separation and division;[15]

[11] The whole passage is as follows: "Sic quoque unus sit omnia dum ex uno omnia, per substantiæ scilicet unitatem; et nihilominus custodiatur oeconomiæ sacramentum, quae unitatem in trinitatem disponit, tres dirigens, Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum. Tres autem non statu sed gradu, nec substantia sed forma, nec potestate sed specie; unius autem substantiæ et unius status et unius potestatis, quia unus Deus, ex quo et gradus isti et formæ et species in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti deputantur." Adv. Prax. 2.

[12] Ibid. 9.

[13] Ibid. 14.

[14] Ibid. 4, 8; 2; De Praescript. 13.

[15] Adv. Prax. 2, 3, 8.

also that Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are "a trinity of one divinity," that "the Son and the Spirit are of the substance of the Father," and that the Son is God only in so far as He is "ex unitate Patris." [16] The truth seems to be that Tertullian, in common with other writers of this period, Irenæus, Hippolytus, Novation, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen, made use of explanations and expressions savoring of Subordinationism simply to defend the distinction of the divine persons against Modalism, but in his usual passionate way he allowed himself to be carried somewhat beyond the limits of strictly orthodox teaching.

2°. The author's way of speaking is also unsatisfactory in reference to the generation of the Son. He admits indeed the eternal existence of the Word, even as a distinct hypostasis,[17] and also that the Word thus existing from all eternity is properly called Son,[18] but this notwithstanding he contends that there was a time when the Son was not,[19] and that the Word was uttered by the Father in view and at the time of creation, by which utterance His generation became perfect.[20] Hence besides the eternal generation of the Son in the bosom of the Father, which seems to be put more or less on a par with conception, the author admits a kind of temporal generation in which the Word is brought forth as perfect Son. In this matter he likely enough formed his views on the writings of the Apologists, who had used similar terms.[21]

3°. In reference to the God-Man it is specially deserving of notice that the author strikes the exact terms in bringing out the unity of person and the duality of natures, thus neatly formulating the doctrine which the Council of Chalcedon defined in almost identical words two centuries later. Commenting on the opening verse of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, where it is said that Christ is the seed of David according to the flesh and declared God according to the Spirit, he writes: "He therefore is God, the Word and Son of

[16] De Pudic. 21; Adv. Prax. 2; 19.
[17] Ibid. 5.
[18] Ibid. 7.
[19] Adv. Hermog. 3.
[20] Adv. Prax. 7.
[21] Cfr. D'Alès, La Théologie de Tertullien, 81–102.

God. We see a twofold state, not confused, but united in one person, God and the man Jesus." [22] And not only, he says in another place, are there two distinct natures in one and the same Christ, but also two modes of action; for the properties of the two natures remain truly distinct.[23] This might very well serve as a definition against the seventh-century Monothelites. For the rest his Christology is practically the same as that of Irenæus, only that he holds the singular view of Christ's Blessed Mother having lost her virginity in His birth.[24] To this assertion, however, he was most likely driven by his anxiety to defend the reality of Christ's human nature against the Docetæ and Valentinians.

4°. In his soteriology he brings out the vicarious character of Christ's redemptive work, although his views are rather undeveloped as regards details. The Son of God became incarnate that He might expiate our sins, and thus the innocent Christ was substituted for us sinners; without this our ruin could not have been repaired.[25] Jesus was the new Adam in whom the souls of us all were contained.[26] It was for our redemption that the Word took our body and our soul *ex Maria,* and subjected Himself to all our weaknesses and infirmities, sin alone excepted.[27] Thus the Incarnation is the world's only hope.

5°. After the redemption is thus accomplished, our salvation is in our own hands. It was through an abuse of free will that sin and all its terrible consequences entered the world,[28] and now that sin has been blotted out by the blood of the Saviour, it is by a good use of our free will that we must attain salvation. To this we are strictly obliged, because we are the debtors of God; our eternal happiness must come to us as a reward of our merits.[29] This view of satisfaction and personal merit reveals Tertullian's legal bent of mind, yet, if rightly understood, it expresses the objective truth with great

[22] Adv. Prax. 27.
[23] De Carne Christi, 5.
[24] Ibid. 23.
[25] De Bapt. 11.
[26] De Resurr. Carn. 53.
[27] De Carne Christi, 16, 14; 10, 14; 5–9.
[28] Adv. Marcion. II, 5, 6, 7; I, 22.
[29] De Poenit. 2; 6; De Orat. 3, 4; De Exhort. Cast. 2.

exactness, and hence it survives in our modern text-books of Dogmatic Theology. It is, however, only a new formulation of a doctrine as old as Christianity.

6°. On the Church the author offers nothing new, although, even after he had become a Montanist, he bore witness to the fact, sarcastically it is true, that the mother-churches, of which he had made so much in his earlier days, were regarded as in some way depending on the jurisdiction of Rome. His sarcastic use of the terms Pontifex Maximus, Episcopus episcoporum, must have rested upon a more solid foundation than the mere pretension of Callistus to the powers indicated by these titles.

7°. In his teaching on the sacraments there are some points that deserve special notice. Baptism, in which the recipient is reborn in water as the divine *ichtus,* is ordinarily necessary for salvation, but it may be replaced by martyrdom.[30] It can be conferred only once, and if administered by heretics it is invalid.[31] Children are baptized according to the custom of the Church, but it were better to wait until they can be instructed.[32] The bishop is the ordinary minister, but with his consent priests and deacons can also baptize; and so can lay persons, provided they are not women.[33] Baptism is solemnly administered at Easter and Pentecost, still it is valid if conferred at other times.[34]

Confirmation is administered immediately after baptism. The laying on of hands is preceded by an unction, but it is not altogether clear whether this is regarded as an essential part of the sacramental rite.[35]

The Eucharist is the body and blood of the Lord, wherewith the flesh is nourished that the soul may fatten on its God. It is the banquet prepared for the returning prodigal, the food which Christ Himself places before us.[36] Those who receive it are very careful that nothing of the consecrated bread and wine fall to the ground.[37] It is distributed by those

[30] De Bapt. 1; 12, 13; 16.
[31] Ibid. 15.
[32] Ibid. 15; 18.
[33] Ibid. 17.
[34] Ibid. 19.
[35] Cfr. O'Dwyer, Confirmation, 22, 54 sqq.
[36] De Resurr. Carn. 8; De Pudic. 9.
[37] De Corona, 3.

who preside over the assembled faithful; it is also preserved to be taken on fast days.[38] Finally it is offered as a sacrifice, both for the souls departed and on the anniversary of martyrs.[39] All this obviously implies belief in the Real Presence, and hence in another place the author goes so far as to say that those who touch the Eucharist with hands that have made idols torture the Lord's body.[40]

On the question of penance Tertullian was not always consistent, yet he never denied that the power of the keys had been given to the Church. Even after he had become a Montanist, he only tried to limit its application, and that merely as a matter of prudence and expediency. Of this, however, more will be said in another chapter.

Holy orders the author speaks of in passing. The hierarchy is made up of bishops, priests, and deacons, who perform liturgical functions and instruct the faithful.[41] In several places he seems to hold that the distinction between the clergy and laity is simply the result of ecclesiastical legislation.[42]

Marriages must be contracted before the Church; entered upon in any other way, they are considered as adulterous unions.[43] After his defection from the faith, the author became quite rabid on the subject of marriage, demanding that all second marriages be absolutely forbidden.[44]

The only sacrament not mentioned in the writings of Tertullian is that of extreme unction, although it is possible that he refers even to this when he speaks of the *donum curationum*, the gift of healing. Of course, he had no formal sacramental theory, still there is found in his writings a symbolism that may be said to contain the elements from which such a theory was later on developed. It is the visible sign through which the invisible grace of God is communicated. Thus "the flesh is washed, that the soul may be cleansed; the flesh is anointed,

[38] De Orat. 19.
[39] Ibid.; De Corona, 3.
[40] De Idol. 7.
[41] De Bapt. 17; De Monog. 11.
[42] De Exhort. Cast. 7; De Pudic. 21.
[43] Ibid. 4.
[44] Ad Uxor. 1, 1; De Monog. 1, 2, 14.

that the soul may be consecrated; the flesh is signed, that the soul may be fortified; the flesh is overshadowed by the imposition of hands, that the soul may be illumined; the flesh feeds on the body and blood of Christ, that the soul may grow fat on its God." [45]

8°. The author's teaching on eschatological subjects is quite archaic and need not be specially noticed here. A word, however, must be said on his views in reference to the fall of man and its consequences. Adam's fall, he says, brought upon all mankind not only death, but sin and punishment as well. There is a solidarity in this transgression, and it introduced into every soul a stain, an original blemish, a bent to evil.[46] This seems to contain, in its elements at least, the doctrine of original sin.

B — Novatian: His Treatise on the Trinity

Novatian was a disciple and imitator of Tertullian. He was also the first Roman writer who composed his works in the Latin tongue. Up to the middle of the third century he was a priest of good standing, besides being generally esteemed as an eminent rhetorician and philosopher. After the death of Pope Fabian, which occurred January 20, 250, he wrote, in the name of the Roman clergy, several letters to Cyprian of Carthage, dealing with the reconciliation of the *lapsi*. The doctrine contained in them is in perfect harmony with the traditional teaching of the Church. But shortly after this, he became an extreme rigorist and started a schism in opposition to Pope Cornelius. His views were adopted by many others, and at the time of the Council of Nicæa the sect was still in existence. He seems to have been a prolific writer, but of his many works only four have come down to us. These are entitled, *De Cibis Judaicis, De Spectaculis, De Bono Pudicitiæ, De Trinitate.* Only the last one is of real doctrinal value. The following is a brief summary of its contents:

In close adherence to the order followed by Tertullian and

[45] De Resurrect. Carn. 8.

[46] De Anima, 40, 41; De Testim. Animae, 3.

St. Irenæus, the author treats first of the omnipotent Father, who so far transcends the world of finite things that He is beyond all thought; then he dwells at greater length on the nature of the Son, His real or personal distinction from the Father, His true divinity, and the reality of His human nature; finally he devotes one chapter to the doctrine of the Holy Ghost. In purpose and execution the whole is an orderly exposition of the Rule of Faith.

In his teaching on the Father he offers nothing special; but when speaking of the Son he emphasizes the fact that the Word is eternal not merely as Word, but also as Son. His generation is strictly from all eternity, and therefore also His divine sonship; and this necessarily so, for else the Father would not be Father.[47] However, even with this as a sufficient reason for the divine sonship, there is a sort of second generation when the Word was uttered by the Father in view of the creative work.[48] And thus the author seems to fall back into the course of reasoning initiated by the Apologists.

Between the Father and the Son there is a *communio substantiæ,* a common possession of the same substance, so that the Son is *substantia divina,* truly divine.[49] The Father is indeed anterior to the Son, but only in as much as He is Father; and so the Son is posterior to the Father, but only in as much as He is Son. In substance and being they are coeternal.[50] The Son is, however, a second person, and as such distinct from the Father. Nay, He is not only distinct, but in some way inferior; for He is neither invisible nor incomprehensible as is the Father.[51] Here we have the logical inconsistency again that occurs in nearly all these writers. Its probable explanation was given above.

The Holy Ghost is never called God by the author; yet He is represented as one of the Trinity, possessed of the attributes of the Godhead. He is the illuminator of things divine, a heavenly power, existing from all eternity, and still in

[47] De Trin. 31.
[48] Ibid.
[49] Ibid. 11–24; 31.
[50] De Trin. 24.
[51] Ibid. 31, 27, 61.

some way inferior to the Son.[52] It is from the Son that He receives what He gives to creatures.[53]

In his Christology the author strongly emphasizes the unity of person in the Saviour, but without sacrificing the distinction of the two natures. Christ is at the same time true God and true man, born of a virgin, and having a nature like ours.[54] Even as man Jesus is the Son of God, not in virtue of a divine generation, or naturally, but in consequence of the personal union of His human nature with the Word. The author treats as heretics all those who deny either the reality of Christ's humanity or the truth of His divinity.[55]

Many other points of doctrine are touched upon, such as the creation of the world, man's likeness to God, his freedom, the immortality of his soul, the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the Church and in the hearts of the faithful, but as all this is referred to only in passing it need not detain us here.

C — St. Cyprian: His Teaching on the Church

Cyprian was born in Africa, about the year 200, of wealthy pagan parents. Early in life he embraced the career of a rhetorician and won great renown in the schools of Carthage. When about forty-six years old, he was converted to Christianity and shortly after was elevated to the priesthood. Towards the end of the year 248, or early in 249, he was made bishop of Carthage and metropolitan of Proconsular Africa. He was not an eminent theologian but a model bishop, having a practical rather than a speculative mind. During the terrible persecution of Decius (250-251), he concealed himself in order not to deprive his flock of their pastor; but seven years later, when the persecution of Valerius broke out, he remained at his post in spite of all entreaties. In a short while he was arrested and after a brief trial, the Acts of which are still extant, he was beheaded for the faith, September 1, 258.

In theology St. Cyprian was a close follower of Tertullian, whom he was fond of calling his master; but he had none of

[52] Ibid. 16, 29.
[53] Ibid. 16.
[54] Ibid. 24, 13; 21, 23.
[55] Ibid. 11.

his master's impetuosity and passionate violence. Of him St. Jerome writes: "It would be superfluous to raise a monument to his genius, as his works are more brilliant than the sun." Soon after his death, Cyprian's writings were collected by Pontius, his deacon and intimate friend. They comprise sermons, pamphlets, tractates, and letters. In these he touches upon almost every point of doctrine and moral practice, but as far as the History of Dogmas is concerned, only his views on Church government and his contribution to Sacramental Theology are of real importance.

The Church, as conceived by St. Cyprian, is constituted after the fashion of a municipal commonwealth, having its *plebs*, made up of the ordinary faithful, and its *ordo* or *clerus*, consisting of those who are entrusted with governmental powers.[56] The constitution of the *ordo* is hierarchial. At the head, in each particular community, stands the bishop, who holds the "sacerdotii sublime fastigium." His authority descends in ever diminishing degrees to priests, deacons, and subdeacons. There are also other persons entrusted with various ecclesiastical functions, as acolytes, exorcists, and lectors.[57] Of ostiarii or porters, who at that time held a clerical rank in the church of Rome, no mention is made.

Thus the Church is a closely knit and sharply defined unit, of which the clergy and the laity are the constituent parts.[58] The chief bond of union in this collective body is the governing authority derived from Christ. When the consecrating prelates lay their hands on the head of the new bishop, to "confer upon him the episcopate," he is made to share in the Saviour's own authority over the faithful entrusted to his care. In virtue of this consecration he can claim as applied to himself the words spoken to the Apostles: "He that heareth you, heareth me." [59] The Apostles were the bishops of old, and the present bishops are the Apostles of to-day.

However, the bishops must not use their power tyrannically; they must feed their flock on the heavenly nourishment laid up in the Church. For the Church is the spouse of Christ,

[56] Ep. 51, 1; 59, 19.
[57] Ep. 29; 24, 4; 68; 69.
[58] Ep. 58, 4.
[59] Ep. 66, 4, 8; 3, 3.

to whom she must bring forth spiritual children.[60] Thus there is also provided an internal bond of union, faith and charity, which is made strong by the external bond of authority.

Hence the most fundamental note of the Church is unity: internal unity through practical faith and active charity, and external unity of due subjection to lawful pastors. And this unity was intended by Christ Himself. It is typified by His seamless robe, and called to the minds of all by the Eucharistic bread and wine, which, though derived from many grains of wheat and many grapes, are nevertheless but one heavenly nourishment.[61] To this unity the growth of the Church and her consequent dispersion through many lands offers no obstacle. For from one sun dart forth many rays, from one spring flow many rivulets, from one tree spread out many branches; yet in each instance unity is preserved by the oneness of the source.[62] So, as there is one God, one founder of the Church, and one source of authority, the Church ever remains one in spite of her diffusion throughout the world.

The proximate reason why this universal Church is firmly fixed in its unity is the solidarity of the episcopate.[63] Just as the Apostles formed only one Apostolic college, and only one Apostolic power was shared by all *in solidum,* so all the bishops together form only one episcopate, each one sharing in the powers given to it as a body.[64] Hence if an individual bishop is neglectful of his duty, the others must come to the rescue of his flock.[65] And to emphasize this corporate union and unity, Christ built His Church on one alone, on Peter; for although after the resurrection He gave equal powers to all His Apostles . . . nevertheless, in order to make manifest the unity, He so disposed matters by His own authority that the origin of this same unity should flow from one.[66] Heresies and schisms may and do arise, but they do not affect the unity of the Church. The well-disposed do not separate them-

[60] De Unit. 4–6; Ep. 33, 1.
[61] De Unit. 7; Ep. 63, 13; 59, 5.
[62] De Unit. 5.
[63] Ibid. 4.
[64] Ibid. 3.
[65] Ep. 68, 3.
[66] De Unit. 4.

selves from her communion. The wind does not blow away the wheat, nor does it tear up the tree that has its roots struck deep in the ground; it is the chaff that is blown about by every passing breeze, and trees without roots that are thrown down by the storm.[67]

And as there is thus unity in the Church of Christ, so is that Church also one. To her is applicable the Lord's saying, "He that is not with me is against me, and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad." Without the Church there is no salvation.[68] He cannot have God as his Father, who does not have the Church as his mother.[69] The Holy Ghost, the Sanctifier, was given to the Church and in her alone are treasured up the means of salvation. Outside the Church there is no baptism, no priesthood, no altar. She is the Ark outside of which there is no safety from the flood, the sealed spring from which outsiders cannot draw.[70]

For the better government of the Church, and to meet special difficulties that may arise, it is expedient that councils be held from time to time, which bishops from the same region attend and at which they act as one body. The decrees passed in these councils have a binding force and must be observed even by the bishops.[71] In the matter of convening provincial synods periodically, St. Cyprian simply enforced a well established custom of the African Church, which dated at least from the beginning of the third century. Over these synods he himself presided, and although according to his theory all bishops shared one divinely constituted authority *in solidum,* nevertheless in practice he seems to have claimed a real primacy over the whole of Proconsular Africa.

What, then, about the Primacy over the whole Church? Not only is unity the fundamental note of each individual church, or of a collection of churches belonging to the same region, but of the universal Church, the Church Catholic, as well. That Church had never yet gathered in council, and although there was kept up a constant correspondence between

[67] De Unit. 9; cfr. 3; 5; 6.
[68] Ep. 73, 21.
[69] Ep. 74, 7; De Unit. 6.
[70] Cfr. De Unit. 10; 11; 12; 13.
[71] Ep. 64, 1.

the particular churches of her communion, yet the episcopate as a whole had no opportunity to act as one body. Was there a head somewhere? Some one bishop endowed with authority to speak for all and to make his decision binding upon their consciences? Did Cyprian admit such a primacy?

Certain it is that Cyprian regarded the constitution of the universal Church as monarchical. The Church Catholic was to his mind not merely a gathering of coördinated local churches. He taught quite clearly that Christ built His Church on Peter; that Peter was at once her foundation and head. And Peter, he admitted, continued to live in the Bishop of Rome; hence in so far at least he acknowledged the Bishop of Rome as the Head of the Church. The "cathedra Petri" was to him the fountain and source of all ecclesiastical life: "Ecclesiæ Catholicæ matrix et radix."[72] Hence, whilst speaking of the schism of Felicissimus, he told his own flock: "God is one and Christ is one, and there is one Church and one *cathedra* founded by the voice of the Lord upon Peter."[73] And writing to a bishop who showed himself inclined to follow the anti-Pope Novatian, he argued: "Cornelius was made bishop by the judgment of God and of Christ . . . when the place of Fabian, that is, the place of Peter, and the dignity of the sacerdotal *cathedra* was vacant." Again, of those schismatics who sought protection in Rome, he wrote: "They dare even set sail for the *cathedra* of Peter and the *ecclesia principalis,* whence sacerdotal unity took its rise, carrying with them letters from schismatics and impious persons, oblivious of the fact that the Romans are they whose faith was praised by the Apostle, and to whom perfidy cannot have access."[74]

The Roman Primacy is brought out still more clearly in Cyprian's treatise *De Catholicæ Ecclesiæ Unitate.* In chapter 4 occurs the passage: "The Lord saith to Peter: 'I say to thee, thou art Peter, and upon this Rock will I build my Church!' (To the same He saith after His resurrection: 'Feed my sheep!' Upon him He builds His Church, and to

[72] Ep. 48, 3.
[73] Ep. 43, 5.
[74] Ep. 55, 8; 59, 14.

him He commends the feeding of His sheep), and although after His resurrection He confers a similar power upon all the Apostles and says: 'As the Father hath sent me, I also send you. Receive the Holy Spirit: if you forgive any one's sins, they shall be forgiven him; if you retain any one's sins, they shall be retained,' nevertheless in order to show forth the unity (He established one *cathedra*), and by His own authority He disposed matters in such a way, that the beginning (and reason) of unity should proceed from one. That indeed were all the Apostles what Peter was, associated with him in a similar honor and power, but the inception of both proceeds from the unity (and the Primacy is given to Peter), in order to point out that the Church of Christ is one (and that the *cathedra* is one). (All indeed are pastors, but the flock is shown to be one, and this must be fed by the Apostles in perfect agreement of mind. Whoso does not hold this unity, does he believe he has faith? Whoso deserts the *cathedra* of Peter, upon whom the Church is founded, does he trust that he is in the Church?)" [75]

If this text be taken as it stands, including the passages enclosed in parentheses, it undoubtedly asserts the Primacy, both as given to Peter and as continuing in his successors. But until a few years ago, the text was quite commonly regarded as interpolated; and most non-Catholic critics maintain this even now. The reason advanced for asserting that the text was tampered with by a later hand, is the fact that there are three series of manuscripts, in each one of which the text has a different reading. One contains the reading cited above; another leaves out the passages enclosed in parentheses; whilst the third is a combination of the other two. As there appeared no compelling reason why the second series of manuscripts should omit passages contained in the first, it was quite generally assumed outside of Catholic circles that the first had been interpolated by some one who was desirous of making St. Cyprian defend the Primacy of Rome.

Thus the matter stood until a few years ago, when Dom

[75] De Unit. 4.

Chapman undertook to trace up the history of the different manuscripts. The results of his long and detailed studies have been given to the learned world as follows: Both the first and the second series are undoubtedly genuine. They are faithful copies of the work of St. Cyprian. The difference of the reading is accounted for in this way. The first series is derived from a copy which Cyprian sent to Rome during the Novatian schism. In order to strike at the root of the schism, he inserted the passages referring to the Primacy of Peter and to the consequent authoritative position of the Roman Bishop. The second series originated from a copy directed against Felicissimus, who was then disturbing the peace of the church at Carthage. In this, as is obvious, there would be no need of appealing to Peter's Primacy nor to the authority of Rome.[76]

Batiffol, Harnack, and many other scholars admit Dom Chapman's contention that the text of the manuscript in question is undoubtedly authentic, although they do not subscribe to all his arguments leading up to this conclusion. The charge of interpolation, they say, must forever be abandoned. In whatever way the difference of reading in the two series of manuscripts may finally be explained, certain it is that both hand down the genuine doctrine of St. Cyprian.[77] As this is the only point of real importance, the long continued controversy may be considered to have been set at rest. In consequence, the Anglican contention, that Cyprian's views on the constitution of the Church support the Episcopalian position, becomes doubly untenable. If in the heat of conflict, during the baptismal controversy, Cyprian apparently failed to see the full bearing of his previous teaching on Church government, that only shows how short-sighted and inconsistent human reason may become when obscured by passion. It does not mean a repudiation of his teaching as proposed in times of peace.

In reference to the connection between the Church and the sacraments, St. Cyprian adopted the view of Tertullian, hold-

[76] Revue Benedictine, V, 19 (1902), V, 20 (1903).

[77] Cfr. Batiffol, Primitive Catholicism, 366–373.

ing that these visible means of sanctification are of no avail outside her communion. Hence heretics cannot confer the sacraments validly. This view was emphatically rejected by Rome, with the result that a rather animated controversy was carried on between Cyprian and Pope Stephen, of which a short account will be given below. Of Cyprian's teaching on the sacraments the following points may be noted:

1°. Baptism, which is a second and spiritual birth, not only may but must be administered to children. There is no need of deferring it till the eighth day after birth, as is contended by some because of the law governing circumcision among the Jews. Whenever conferred, baptism produces grace in the souls of children as well as in those of adults; and this all the more readily because these little ones have no personal sins, but only the "borrowed" sin of Adam.[78] Baptism of water may be replaced by martyrdom, which is a baptism of blood; this confers even a greater grace and exerts a higher power.[79]

2°. Confirmation is administered by the laying on of hands, anointing the forehead with chrism, and the recital of a prayer. Through this rite the Holy Ghost is given to the newly baptized.[80]

3°. The Holy Eucharist is also received immediately after baptism, and thenceforth more or less frequently according to the devotion of the faithful.[81] Its worthy reception presupposes freedom from grievous sins; for it is the "holy body of the Lord." Those who venture to approach the sacred table without having done proper penance for their sins, profane the Saviour's body and blood.[82] This teaching evidently implies belief in the Real Presence. Furthermore, the Eucharist is a true sacrifice, which was first offered by Christ, and now by priests in His stead.[83] It is identical with the sacrifice of the cross, and through it the Redeemer's sufferings are pre-

[78] Ad Donat. 4; Ep. 64, 2, 5.
[79] Ep. 73, 22; Ad Fortunat. Praef. 4.
[80] Ep. 73, 9; 70, 2.
[81] Ep. 70, 2.
[82] Ep. 15, 1; 63, 4; De Laps. 25.
[83] Ep. 63, 4, 14.

sented to God. It is efficacious for the living and the dead, and is also offered up for penitent sinners.[84]

4°. Penance blots out sins committed after baptism. For minor faults private penance, such as alms-giving, is sufficient; but if grievous sins have been committed, especially sins of adultery, apostasy, and homicide, recourse must be had to the bishop.[85] He takes cognizance of these sins, imposes a proportionate penance, and when that has been duly performed reconciles the penitent to the Church.[86] Even secret sins, such as sins of thought, when they are of a grievous nature, must be confessed; but no sins are so grave that they cannot be forgiven by the Church. In some cases, however, reconciliation is deferred till the hour of death.[87]

5°. Holy orders are conferred by the bishop assisted by the presbyterium.[88] When a new bishop is to be consecrated, all the neighboring bishops of the same province come together and take part in the ceremony.[89] Simple priests offer up the Holy Sacrifice where the bishop does not celebrate; they may also be delegated to reconcile penitents. It is the office of deacons to assist in the sacred liturgy, and to supervise the distribution of alms among the poor.[90]

6°. On matrimony the author has nothing special, except that he insists strongly on the indissolubility of Christian marriage and forbids all matrimonial alliances of the faithful with pagans.[91]

With these three authors as its first representatives, Latin theology made a fair start. Tertullian and Novatian contributed very extensively to the clearing up of orthodox Trinitarian and Christological teaching, whilst Cyprian's writings on the Church will ever be a source of valuable information. It was not until a century later that the work thus begun received any noticeable development, but the lines of that development are already clearly traced in the works of these three writers.

[84] Ep. 63, 17; 1, 2; 16, 2; 17, 2.
[85] De Opere et Eleem. 11; 14; De Bono Patient. 14; De Laps. 16.
[86] De Laps. 16.
[87] Ibid. 28; 29.
[88] Ep. 38, 2.
[89] Ep. 67, 5.
[90] Ep. 3, 3; 56, 3; 18, 1; 57, 6.
[91] Testim. 3, 62, 90; De Laps. 6.

CHAPTER XI

THE BAPTISMAL CONTROVERSY: PENANCE IN THE EARLY CHURCH

In the preceding chapter we have confined our remarks to the doctrinal statements of the writers whose works called for a brief review, thus leaving aside all discussion of the various controversies that were going on during the first half of the third century. This was done for clearness' sake, so as to keep the common teaching unobscured by the divergency of private views. However, a few words must be said about two points that caused considerable stir in Catholic circles, the one giving rise to the baptismal controversy and the other to the question of penance.

A — The Baptismal Controversy [1]

Although the reception of converts into the Church was always considered to belong officially to the bishop, since he was placed by the Holy Ghost as shepherd over the flock of Christ, still, under given conditions, priests and deacons and even lay persons might receive them by duly administering the sacrament of baptism. In all these cases, however, the ordinary supposition was that persons thus conferring the sacrament were in communion with the Church. But what if they belonged to an heretical sect? Would the sacrament in that case be valid? Or would it be necessary to treat these converts as if they had not been baptized at all? The same, of course, would also apply to confirmation administered by an heretical bishop.

Till the middle of the second century there was no occasion for inquiring into this matter, as there were practically no

[1] Cfr. Tixeront, H. D. I, 366–376; Duchesne, The Early History of the Church, I, 303–312.

heretical sects which had organized communities of their own; but a little later, when Marcion and the followers of Montanus established separate churches, the question became very practical. At first the course of action adopted does not appear to have been uniform; some bishops baptizing these converts and others simply imposing their hands by way of reconciliation. It was during Cyprian's time that the matter came up for general discussion, and the result was the baptismal controversy.

Taking it as an incontestable principle that the Church alone is commissioned to forgive sins and to impart the Holy Ghost, and overlooking entirely the distinction between a valid and a fruitful reception of the sacraments, Cyprian taught unhesitatingly that baptism administered by heretics was invalid. In this he was, moreover, supported by the authority of Tertullian and a well established custom of rebaptizing converts from heresy, not only in Africa, but also at Antioch, Cæsarea, and other places. He had against him the custom followed at Rome, Alexandria, Cæsarea in Palestine, and most places of Western Europe; but above all the weighty authority of Pope Stephen.

When he explained his position to the Pope, in order to solicit his approval, the latter not only refused to sanction the African custom, but sent a peremptory order to discontinue it in future. "Si qui ergo a quacumque heresi venient ad vos, nihil innovetur nisi quod traditum est, ut manus illis imponatur in poenitentiam." [2] "If therefore any come to you, no matter from what heretical sect, let nothing be renewed except what has been established by tradition (here at Rome), (namely) that hands be imposed on them by way of penance." Firmilian of Cæsarea, corresponding with Cyprian on this matter, states that "Stephen and those who are of the same mind with him contend that in the baptism of heretics sins are forgiven; because it matters little who confers baptism, since grace is obtained through the invocation of the Blessed Trinity, the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit. Nay, as the

[2] Ep. 74, ad Firmilianum; cfr. Ep. 75, ad Cyprianum.

successor of Peter, upon whom the foundations of the Church have been laid, he says even that through the sacrament of baptism thus conferred all the stains of the old man are washed away, deadly sins are forgiven, the right of divine sonship is acquired, and a fit preparation is made for life eternal." [3] Surely the "successor of Peter" had a very thorough understanding of the efficacy of baptism.

If in the matter of Papal authority Cyprian's practice had corresponded with his theory, as explained in the preceding chapter, this decision of the Pope should have ended the discussion. But in the heat of the combat he seems to have forgotten completely what he had so strongly and clearly set forth in times of peace. And so the discussion waxed furious as time passed on. Backed up by the councils over which he presided at Carthage, and also by the letters he received from Firmilian of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, Cyprian became abusive in his correspondence with the Pope. But all to no purpose. Stephen stood firm; nor did Cyprian think of yielding. Finally matters were brought to a settlement by the death of the contestants; both laid down their life for the faith. However, even before Cyprian was called to martyrdom, peace was established between him and the successor of Stephen, Xystus II, and shortly after this the Roman custom prevailed in Africa. A conciliar decision was given at Arles in 314.

Whether Cyprian's insubordination, precisely as viewed by himself, touched merely a matter of discipline, or had at least an indirect bearing on faith, it is not so easy to decide. Many Catholics take the former view, exculpating the bishop of Carthage altogether, on the plea that in matters of discipline well established local customs have the force of law, with which it would be imprudent for the Church to interfere. However, this explanation does not seem to be in harmony with the facts of the case. Failing to distinguish between the validity and the efficacy of the sacraments, Cyprian necessarily inferred the invalidity of heretical baptism from his view on the position of the Church in the economy of salvation. Hence

[3] Ep. 75, Firmiliani ad Cyprianum.

the Roman practice, though he was willing to tolerate it for the sake of peace, appeared to him as treason to the Church. When he wrote: "Pro honore Ecclesiæ atque unitate pugnamus," [4] we battle for the honor of the Church and for unity, he was hardly thinking of discipline alone. However, with all its regrettable features, the controversy contributed not a little towards clearing up an important point of doctrine, namely, that the validity of the sacraments does not depend on the faith and virtue of the minister. It was this that later on stood St. Augustine in good stead in his contention with the Donatists.

B — Penance in the Early Church [5]

Baptism was from the very first regarded as a spiritual regeneration, a rebirth to newness of life, presupposing a complete break with the sinful past and imposing the solemn obligation of reaching forward to future holiness. Hence in the ideal Christian life there was no room for sin; and if not for sin, then neither for penance. This all true followers of Christ clearly realized, but they realized not less clearly that the ideal was difficult of attainment; that somehow sin usually had a part in the best of them, and therefore penance must be included in the economy of salvation through Christ. The fact is, this consciousness of post-baptismal sins and of the constant need of penance was so vivid that it gave a distinct coloring to the religious literature of the early Church. From the Shepherd of Hermas to the Penitential Canons of Peter of Alexandria, there is among the various documents which have come down to us hardly one that does not in some way refer to the necessity of penance. Hence it is not the fact of penance that is open for discussion, but its nature and form. What manner of penance was it? Had it in the beginning an exclusively private character, or did it fall under the jurisdiction of the Church? And if the Church was concerned in

[4] Ep. 73, 11.

[5] Cfr. O'Donnell, Penance in the Early Church; Rauschen, Eucharist and Penance, Part II; D'Alès, L'Édit de Calliste; Tixeront, H. D. I, 346–354; Funk, Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen, I. 155–181.

it, did she reconcile the penitent to God by remitting his sins, or only to herself by declaring that he had sufficiently repaired his transgression of her social code? Lastly, if the Church reconciled the penitent to God, did she extend her power in this respect to all repentant sinners or were certain classes excluded from its scope?

That penance for post-baptismal sins, when they were of a serious nature, was never of an exclusively private character is now granted by all scholars; and the evidence leading to this conclusion, even as found in the earliest documents, is decisive. Thus Clement of Rome enjoins the Corinthians to "submit themselves to their priests and be instructed unto penance"; the Didache and the Pseudo-Barnabas direct their Christian readers to "confess their sins in the Church"; St. Ignatius of Antioch tells the Philadelphians that "God remits the sins of all penitents if they repent unto the unity of God and the council of the bishop"; Hermas places penance as practiced by Christians on a parallel with baptism, which was in the hands of the Church; Dionysius of Corinth asks the churches of Pontus to "receive kindly all who have been converted from any falling away, whether crime or heretical depravity"; whilst the author of the Secunda Clementis tells his hearers to "confess their sins while there is still time for repentance." All these documents were issued before 170, and yet every one of them connects penance for post-baptismal sins in some way with the intervention of the Church. After this time the evidence is so overwhelming that it need not even be cited. A mere glance at the preceding chapters will be sufficient to convince any fair-minded reader.

Nor is there much difficulty in showing that this intervention on the part of the Church had for its object the reconciliation of the penitent not only with herself, but also with God; although non-Catholic scholars are generally loath to grant this. First of all it is historically certain, and this even Protestants hardly venture to call any longer in question, that at the beginning of the third century the Church peacefully exercised the power of forgiving sins. Not even Tertullian, or Novatian, or Hippolytus, in his wildest diatribes against the

leniency of the Popes, ever dreamt of denying that the Church had power to forgive sins. They exempted certain sins from the range of this power, at least for disciplinary purposes; but the power itself they admitted, forced thereto by the *consensus* of the churches. Where, then, in the next place, is the starting point of this *consensus?* If in the beginning the Church reconciled penitents only to herself, when did she first presume to reconcile them also to God?

That history does not record a change of views and practice in this matter is freely granted, in so far as positive evidence comes in question. But more. When schism and heresy bring the reconciliation of penitents into the foreground of discussion, the whole Christian world understands it to imply the forgiveness of sins effected through the ministry of the Church; and not even the hoariest among the official custodians of tradition, though taught by men whose youth dated back to the dawn of the second century, have apparently the slightest recollection that in olden times this matter was regarded in a different light. When Irenæus, who had been a disciple of Polycarp, who in his turn had been a disciple of John the Apostle and Evangelist, relates incidentally that certain women perished miserably through despair, because they were ashamed to confess their sins, does he even hint that they might have confessed their sins to God alone and thus have obtained forgiveness without recourse to the power of the Church? The inference plainly is that he conceived the intervention of the Church to have for its object the forgiveness of sins as well as the restoration to her communion. But at all events, neither he nor any of those taught by him, nor any others by whom the traditions of early Christianity were transmitted to the third century bishops, ever raised the slightest protest against the supposed innovation of forgiving sins. Under the circumstances this is more than an *argumentum ex silentio.* It shows that these men were as conversant with the words of the Saviour recorded by St. John as was Origen when he wrote: "He on whom Jesus has breathed, as He did on His Apostles . . . remits what God remits and retains sins that are incurable. . . . This is

seen from what is said in the Gospel of St. John concerning the power of remission granted to the Apostles: 'Whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven, and whose sins you shall retain they are retained.'" [6]

When, therefore, we read in the documents belonging to the sub-Apostolic age that Christian penitents must have recourse to the ministry of the Church, although the expressions used in themselves tell us nothing about the nature of this ministry, yet in the light that is thrown upon them by the subsequent attitude and practice of men who were perfectly familiar with the views entertained in these early times, they bear positive testimony to the fact that the intervention of the Church in the reconciliation of penitents was regarded then, as it was regarded later on, to extend itself even to the forgiveness of sins. A little historic sense would seem to make this conclusion unavoidable.

The third question still remains: To what extent did the Church make use of this power of forgiving sins? Did she extend it to all penitents, or were certain classes excluded from its benefits? That the power was not limited in itself, or by the terms of its concession by Christ, is sufficiently obvious, as its purpose was to make salvation possible for those who truly repented of their sins; and this is clearly acknowledged by Tertullian in his schismatic ravings against Callistus. Arguing against the remission of the sin of adultery, which the Pope had granted on the plea that the Church has the power to forgive sins, he cries out: "The Church, you say, has the power to forgive sins. This I acknowledge the more and adjudge proper, who have the Paraclete Himself in the persons of the new prophets, saying: 'The Church has the power to forgive sins, but I will not do it, lest they commit others again.' . . . Let Penance win pardon from the bishop for lighter sins, for the greater and irremissible from God alone." [7]

Hence the question narrows itself down to this: Did the

[6] De Orat. 28; cfr. In Luc. Hom. 17.

[7] De Pudic. 21, 7.

Church, though conscious of having the power to forgive all sins, at any period restrict the use of this power so as to exclude the *crimina mortalia*, usually classed as adultery, homicide, and apostasy? Thus limited the question is purely disciplinary, and as such does not strictly belong to the History of Dogmas. However, a few general remarks on this topic will be in place.

Hippolytus, whilst in open schism against Pope Callistus, accuses him of being the first to concede reconciliation to adulterers and fornicators and criminals of all sorts. "That deceiver," he says, "was the first who made an attempt to give free indulgence to the depraved lusts of mankind, when he asserted that all men's sins were remitted by himself." [8] As far as we know, Callistus only issued a decree, and a peremptory one, says Tertullian, that adulterers and fornicators should be admitted to communion after they had duly repented and performed the penance enjoined; though it is quite possible that the decree was intended to be universal in its extension. But however that may be, he acted in perfect harmony with the traditions of the past. A few pertinent instances will show this with sufficient clearness.

Thus when Hermas draws a parallel between the second penance and baptism, he evidently excludes from the efficacy of the former no sin whatever, although he limits its availability to a certain period of time. Hence we may rightly infer that in his day nothing was known of the irremissibility of certain sins. In fact, he explicitly states: "As many as do penance from their hearts, and purify themselves of their iniquities, and do not add to their evil deeds, shall receive from God the forgiveness of their former sins." [9] The only irremissible sin he knows of is that of persons who are so hardened as to refuse to repent. Yet, as was pointed out above, according to him forgiveness was to be obtained through the Church.

Neither Clement of Rome, nor the author of the Didache, nor Ignatius of Antioch, nor the Secunda Clementis, know

[8] Philosoph. 9, 12. [9] Simil. 8, 11, 3.

of any restrictions; whilst Dionysius of Corinth explicitly directs the churches of Pontus to "receive back kindly all who have been converted from any falling away, whether crime or heretical depravity." [10] Irenæus certainly did not exclude fornicators from pardon, as is sufficiently evident from what he says about the women who had been seduced by a certain Marcus, and to whom reference was made above. The church of Rome knew nothing about the exclusion of converted heretics, as appears from the same author's remark about Cerdon, and also from Tertullian's statement about Marcion." [11] Clement of Alexandria, citing the reconciliation of the robber chief by St. John, evidently saw no reason why homicides should not be reconciled, although he was a priest of good standing and a learned man, and therefore must have known what was and what was not in harmony with the custom of the Church.[12] And lastly, even Tertullian, whilst still a Catholic, made the second penance quite as extensive in its efficacy as that of baptism, calling it a second plank of salvation for all those who unfortunately had fallen into grievous sin after their baptismal regeneration.[13] And this he himself acknowledged after he had become a Montanist, saying that he did not blush for his change of views.[14] Surely this excludes anything like an appeal to tradition for the supposed restriction placed upon the use of her power by the Church.

Taking all this into account, it would seem to be historically certain that the Church Catholic never barred the way to reconciliation even to those who were guilty of the greater sins. She placed her conditions of readmission, imposed a severe and usually protracted penance, but when all this had been complied with, she was glad to receive the lost sheep back into her fold. In particular or local churches more rigoristic views prevailed at different times; but that is too intricate a question to be dealt with here. As far as the ques-

[10] Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. 4, 23.
[11] Adv. Haeres. 3, 4, 3; De Praescript. 30.
[12] Quis Dives, 42.
[13] De Poenit. 7, 10, cfr. 4, 1; 7, 3.
[14] De Pudio. 1, 11.

tion of penance in the early Church is of interest to the History of Dogmas, quite enough has been said in the preceding paragraphs.

CHAPTER XII

FIRST ATTEMPTS AT SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY IN THE EAST[1]

Until the latter part of the second century no attempt seems to have been made to establish Christian schools, in which the traditional teaching of the Church might be more or less scientifically investigated and explained. The first institution of this kind, so far as the records go, was the catechetical school at Alexandria. Precisely when this school was started is a matter of conjecture, but about 180 it began to attract considerable attention. It was then under the able direction of Pantænus, a converted Stoic philosopher. One of his most distinguished disciples was Clement, who some years later became his successor in the direction of the school. Clement in his turn was succeeded by his own disciple Origen, under whose guidance the school of Alexandria reached its highest fame. Pantænus does not appear to have written any books, but his two immediate successors exerted great literary activity, and their works now call for a brief review.

A — Clement of Alexandria

Titus Flavius Clemens, as his name indicates, was probably descended from a freedman of the Christian consul of that name. After his conversion he studied under several masters, apparently without much satisfaction to himself, until he met Pantænus in Egypt, and with him he found rest for his soul. He was entrusted with the direction of the school in 190, and continued in office until the persecution of Septimus Severus, 202 or 203, forced him to withdraw. He was a man of wide

[1] Cfr. Tixeront, H. D. I, 243–284; Duchesne, The Early History of the Church, I, 247–260; Batiffol, Primitive Catholicism, 146–163; 294–331; Bardenhewer, Altkirch. Lit. II, 15–159.

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

reading, in profane as well as in sacred literature, but his learning appears to have been extensive rather than profound. A saintly priest, and ever devoted to the interests of the faith, he nevertheless always cherished an ardent love for the philosophy of the past. He not only employed its methods in his exposition of Christian doctrine, but frequently also made use of its contents.

It was by means of philosophy that Clement thought he could devise a system of theological teaching which should indeed have faith for its solid and irremovable foundation, but in the building up of its superstructure should draw freely from the sources of natural knowledge. With this end in view he labored for many years at his great work, *Introduction to Christianity,* which consists of three parts called respectively *Protrepticus, Paedagogus* and *Stromata.* The names are taken from the method supposedly followed by the Logos, who first admonishes, then trains, and lastly instructs. The three divisions, however, hang very loosely together, and so too does the reasoning in each part. The work is an attempt at systematizing, but withal a rather poor one.

The leading thought that runs through the three divisions, and that gives some sort of unity to the whole, is the harmony that must necessarily exist between faith and knowledge. Both have their source in the same God, and although revelation and faith must ever hold the first and highest place in the Church of Christ, still philosophy and knowledge should not be excluded from her sacred precincts. There is a middle way between the rationalism of the Pseudo-Gnostics and the extreme supernaturalism of many narrow-minded Catholics. There is a true *gnosis* as well as a false one; a *gnosis* that is indeed not necessary for salvation, but that leads believing Christians to a higher perfection.

With this thought in his mind, Clement begins the *Protrepticus* with an earnest invitation to the pagan world, urging the worshipers of false gods to turn away from the foolish songs of mythology and listen to the new canticle of the Logos, who came forth from Sion to teach the world true wisdom. Pagan gods and mysteries and their sacrificial worship are

but idle vagaries, ugly excrescences of human reason gone astray; and although some philosophers and poets have in many things proclaimed the truth, yet their conception of it was but shadowy and imperfect. The full truth is found only in the Prophets, who were taught by the Holy Spirit. Their teaching is now completed by the Logos, who appeared on earth to cure the world of its moral diseases and make known to men the blessings of God.

Once brought under the influence of the Logos, men must go through a course of training in Christian virtue. This is the object and scope of the *Paedagogus.* The trainer is the Logos Himself, who through the teaching of faith shows His followers how to regulate their daily lives, in relation to God, the neighbor, and themselves. It is not fear that makes His training efficacious, but love and kindness. It is true, the Logos carries a rod, yet this is a symbol of grace rather than of punishment.

In connection with this, the author points out the importance of faith and its sufficiency for all practical purposes of life. Faith, he says, is the perfection of knowledge. Holy Scripture says, whoso believeth in the Son hath life everlasting: what then is there beyond that should be wanting to faith? Nothing: faith is perfect in itself and all-sufficient. However, the perfection of faith is only relative; it is a means of preparing us for what is greater. Beyond the perfection of faith here on earth, looms large the perfection of possession in heaven wherein are fulfilled the words of the Saviour: "Be it done unto thee as thou hast believed."

Faith, then, as shown forth in the practice of virtue is sufficient; but faith may be perfected by knowledge, by the true *gnosis,* which not only accepts the teaching of the Logos and puts it into practice, but aims at an intimate understanding of the things of God. As in one sense faith is the perfection of knowledge, so in another sense is knowledge the perfection of faith. Beginning with faith and ever growing in grace, one must advance along the path of knowledge to a fuller realization of divine things. And so it is only the Gnostic who is a perfect Christian; not the Pseudo-Gnostic of the

sects, but the true Gnostic whose life is in accord with the higher knowledge of the faith. Such a one is indifferent to all adversity, is indefatigable in the practice of charity, and labors incessantly to promote the interests of God. Hence there are two kinds of Christians: the simple folk who are satisfied with believing, and the more intelligent who aim at *gnosis*. They are both dear to the Lord, but those who have *gnosis* are more perfect and therefore entitled to a higher degree of glory in heaven.

In connection with this general summary of the contents of Clement's chief work, the following points, taken in substance from Moehler's History of the Church, are deserving of special attention. They bring out with great clearness the Alexandrian doctor's position in regard to faith.

As the Son of God has become truly man, divine teaching has become human and human teaching has become divine.[2] Faith is based on the authority of the Son of God. Who would be so rash as to demand proofs of God as he would of man?[3] The authority of Christ is represented by the Catholic Church, so that her teaching and her authority are the same as His.[4] Hence faith is the eternal foundation of all religious knowledge; it must guide us in all our studies of divine things.[5] Religious knowledge is acquired by meditating on the truths of faith; faith, therefore, is the criterion of knowledge.[6] True *gnosis,* or *gnosis* according to the mind of the Church, is nothing else than a thorough understanding of the faith, taking due account of the grounds upon which it rests and the relation that exists between the various truths which form its contents.[7] Religious knowledge and faith are of the same nature, and faith itself beckons us to the acquisition of knowledge.[8] Subjective faith is a clinging to the invisible, a union of the soul with the object of faith.[9] As man is free, his faith is essentially an act of obedience to God. Hence no demonstra-

[2] Paedag. 1, 2, 3, 1.
[3] Strom. 6, 1.
[4] Ibid. 2, 11–12; 7, 15–18.
[5] Ibid. 2, 4, 11; 7, 10, 16.
[6] Ibid. 2, 2–4.
[7] Ibid. 7, 10.
[8] Ibid. 6, 2; cfr. 7, 10, 57, 3.
[9] Ibid. 2, 2–4; 5, 1; cfr. Paedag. 2, 2, 8, 4–6.

tion can ever be the cause of faith; it can do no more than make the truth acceptable. Faith depends on the will subject to the all-wise and all-truthful God. And because faith thus necessarily implies submission of the will, hence it belongs to man's moral life and must find issue in works. Faith without works is dead.[10]

Besides the *Introduction to Christianity,* another little treatise has come down to us under the title, *Quis Dives Salvetur, What Rich Man May Be Saved?* In it the author gives a very sane and Christian exposition of the nature and use of property. Admitting the rights of private ownership, he points to the fact that the actual possessors of wealth are nevertheless only stewards of the Lord. They may not waste their possessions in extravagant living, but whatever they do not need for their own reasonable use they must employ in assisting the needy. Thus used, wealth becomes a means of salvation.

Many points of doctrine are casually explained in these two works, especially in the first; but only a few of them can here be mentioned. Something may also be gathered from the numerous fragments of his commentaries of Holy Scripture, which are usually cited under the title of *Adumbrationes.* The main points of interest in reference to the History of Dogmas are the following:

1°. Speaking of the Logos, Clement insists strongly on His eternal generation: as the Father was always Father, so the Logos was always Son; and although He came forward at the moment of creation, yet thereby His state was not changed.[11] In this the view of the Apologists, as interpreted by many modern critics, is evidently corrected.

2°. The Logos is "evidentissime verus Deus"; He is equal to the Lord of the universe, because He is His Son.[12] He is one with the Father,[13] the Father is in the Son and the Son is in the Father: to both prayers are offered up by the faithful.[14]

[10] Strom. 6, 13; 7, 5; 6, 14, 108, 4.
[11] Ibid. 7, 2; 5, 1; Adumbrat. in Joann. 1, 1; Paedag. 1, 8, 62, 3.
[12] Protrept. 10, 110, 1.
[13] Paedag. 1, 8.
[14] Paedag. 1, 8, 62, 3; 1, 7; Strom. 5, 14; 3, 13; 5, 26; In Joan. 1, 1; Paedag. 3, 12, 100, 2.

3°. Of the Holy Ghost the author says nothing very special, yet he represents Him in passing as a divine person and inspirer of Holy Scripture. "There is indeed one Father of all, and also one Word of all, and one Holy Spirit, and He is everywhere." "Not one point of Holy Scripture shall pass away without its fulfillment: for the mouth of the Lord, the Holy Spirit, has spoken whatever is contained therein." [15]

Thus he conceives the Godhead as a Trias, or Trinity, and commenting on a text in the Timæus of Plato, he says, "I understand this to refer to the Holy Trinity: the third is the Holy Spirit, the second is the Son through whom all was made according to the will of the Father." [16] The three must be adored as one God.[17] The Father is incomprehensible and ineffable being; the Son is wisdom, knowledge, truth, and all related thereto; the Holy Spirit is the light of truth, light without darkness, the Spirit of the Lord, who communicates Himself without division to all.[18]

4°. The world was created out of nothing: neither matter nor spirit is eternal, nor did souls exist before they were united to their bodies.[19] Adam and Eve were created in infancy, and their sin consisted in having carnal relations before the time appointed by God. That sin was the source of all evil in the world, and since then no one is without sin, save only the Incarnate Logos. Still to each one only his own sins are imputed.[20] The author speaks occasionally as if there were two souls in man, the one carnal and the other spiritual; however, he defines man as "composed of a rational and irrational part, of soul and body." [21]

5°. In Christ, the Incarnate Logos, there are two natures and only one person. He is one Logos, both God and man; He is God-Man.[22] The author seems to understand quite well the *communicatio idiomatum*, and even holds that the union of the human and the divine elements in Christ was not dis-

[15] Protrept. 1, 6, 42, 1; 9, 82, 1.
[16] Strom. 5, 14.
[17] Paedag. 3, 2.
[18] Strom. 6, 16.
[19] Strom. 5, 14; 3, 13; 5, 26.
[20] Protrept. 11, 111, 1; Strom. 5, 14; 3, 13; 5, 26.
[21] Ibid. 6, 6, 16; 4, 3.
[22] Ibid. 5, 3; 5, 14; Paedag. 1, 6; 3, 1.

solved in death: "The Word living and buried with the Christ is exalted in heaven." [23] Christ's human nature, though real like ours, was not affected by hunger or thirst or other corporal wants, nor was He Himself moved by passions of any kind. He came among us to be our redemption, our ransom, a propitiation for our sins, an immolated victim; He wishes to save all, but each one's salvation will depend on the use he makes of the redemption thus wrought.[24]

6°. Those who wish to be saved must belong to the Church; for she is the city of the Logos, the temple built by God.[25] There is only one Church, the one that has come down to us from olden days, and which heretics try their utmost to split up into many.[26] In this Church there are bishops, priests, and deacons, in imitation, the author thinks, of the angelic hierarchy.[27] Among the Apostles, Peter held the first place, the Primacy over all the rest; for Peter alone together with Himself the Saviour paid the tribute.[28]

7°. Admission into the Church is by baptism. "Being baptized, we are enlightened; being enlightened, we are adopted as sons; being adopted, we are perfected; being perfected, we are made immortal: 'I,' saith He, 'have said, you are gods and sons of the Most High.' Baptism is designated in many ways, a grace, an illumination, perfection, and a bath. A bath, because in it we wash away our sins. A grace, because by it are remitted the punishments due to sins. An illumination, because in it we behold that holy and salutary light by which we see God. Perfection, because that we call perfect to which nothing is wanting. For what can be wanting to him who knows God?" [29]

8°. The Eucharist is repeatedly referred to, but the author's way of speaking of it is not very satisfactory. Although he clearly enough admits the Real Presence, he usually enlarges upon the symbolic aspect of the mystery. "The mixture of

[23] Protrept. 11; Paedag. 1, 5; 1, 6.
[24] Strom. 6, 9, 71, 2; 2, 6; Paedag. 3, 12; 1, 6; Quis Div. 37.
[25] Strom. 4, 20; Paedag. 1, 6.
[26] Strom. 7, 17, 107, 3.
[27] Ibid. 6, 13, 107, 2.
[28] Quis Dives, 21, 3.
[29] Paedag. 1, 6, 26, 1–3.

the two, that is, of the drink and the Word, is called the Eucharist; that is to say, a praiseworthy and remarkable grace, by which those who partake of it are sanctified in body and soul." Still, "this it is to drink the blood of Jesus, namely, to become a partaker of the incorruption of the Lord." [30]

9°. Of penance he says that theoretically Christians should not stand in need of it, since in baptism they have arisen to a new life; but practically they do, as experience only too plainly shows. Some sins are so grievous that they demand a public satisfaction and reconciliation, but this should not be granted more than once. For this ruling the author appeals to Hermas, whom he quotes on the subject.[31] Even the sin of murder may thus be forgiven.[32] For less grievous sins forgiveness may always be obtained, provided the sinner submits to the chastising hand of God.[33]

10°. Marriage among Christians he holds to be indissoluble, even in the case of adultery. This he proves from our Lord's words as recorded by St. Matthew.[34]

11°. In his eschatological teaching the author prepared the way for Origen, in as much as he seems to hold that after the last judgment even the wicked shall finally be led to repentance and thus be reconciled to God.[35]

Thus it may be said that there is much wheat and some chaff in the teaching of Clement. His love of ancient philosophy carried him at times undoubtedly too far, as, for instance, in the excessive moral value he attached to *gnosis*; yet perhaps his worst fault lies in his allegorical interpretation of Holy Scripture. It is true, he explicitly teaches that the Sacred Writings, of both the Old and New Testament, are divinely inspired; but in his exegesis he frequently adopts the principles of Philo, and hence it not rarely happens that in his interpretation sober facts fade away into mere symbols.

B — Origen: Alexandria and Cæsarea

Notwithstanding his vast learning, Clement of Alexandria

[30] Ibid. 2, 2, 19, 4; 20, 1.
[31] Strom. 2, 13.
[32] Quis Dives, 42.
[33] Strom. 4, 24.
[34] Ibid. 2, 23, 145, 3; 146, 2, 3.
[35] Ibid. 7, 2; 6, 14.

did not achieve more than local fame. This is perhaps largely accounted for by the greater brilliancy of Origen, his pupil and immediate successor in the direction of the school. Both men undertook practically the same task, in as much as their common aim was to place the traditional teaching of the Church on a scientific basis; but whilst Clement ended by philosophizing Christianity, Origen succeeded in synthesizing theology. He wrote the first Summa Theologica.

Origen was born of Christian parents, probably at Alexandria. Whilst still a mere child, he was carefully instructed by his father, the martyr Leonidas, and thereafter at an early age he entered the school of Clement. When about seventeen years old, he lost his father, who was martyred for the faith, and thereby the duty of providing for a large and impoverished family devolved upon him. Yet so distinguished was he for learning and holiness that Demetrius, bishop of Alexandria, came shortly after this to his assistance by making him director of the catechetical school. For a number of years he discharged his duty with great success, although some of his views were not acceptable to his ecclesiastical superior. Whilst passing through Cæsarea on his journey to Athens, whither he had been called to confer with certain heretics, he was ordained priest without the sanction of his bishop. This was made the pretext for severing his connection with the school. After several vain attempts on his part to bring about a reconciliation, first with Demetrius and then with his successor Heraclas, Origen permanently established himself at Cæsarea, whither most of his pupils followed him. He died in 254, after having borne imprisonment and torture for the faith.

During all these years, first at Alexandria and then at Cæsarea, Origen was indefatigably active as a writer. Epiphanius estimates his literary productions at six thousand volumes. Of course, by volumes he understands rolls, *volumina*, or *tomoi*, several of which would be required to make a fair sized volume as we take the term. To facilitate this enormous output, a rich and devoted friend, Ambrose by name, placed at his disposal a numerous staff of stenographers and copyists, who took down his lectures and then copied them

for distribution. Most of these writings, including the celebrated *Hexapla* or six-column Bible, have perished. Of those that have come down to us his two treatises, *Against Celsus* and *On First Principles* or *Peri Archon,* are the most famous. It is this latter that contains his system of theology. A brief summary of it may be given as follows; we must bear in mind, however, that by "First Principles" the author understands fundamental doctrines and leading articles of the faith.

By way of preface the author states that the source and fountain of all truth is none other than the teaching of Christ and the Apostles. This lives on in the Church, and therefore her preaching is the criterion and norm of truth. However, as the Apostles gave a clear exposition of those truths only which they deemed necessary for all, whilst such others as are not so necessary they simply stated without explaining them, there is room for further study and investigation on the part of those who are capable of deriving fruit from such labors. And this same plan the Church also follows, teaching that certain doctrines must be accepted, whilst others are still open for discussion.

Then follows a brief summary of the truths that are of faith, namely: The existence of God, creator of all things, who, though incomprehensible in the perfection of His being, may yet in some way be known from the works of His hands. The divinity of the Son, His incarnation, virginal birth, His death for our redemption, His resurrection and ascension into heaven. The existence of the Holy Ghost, associated with the Father and the Son, who is the inspirer of the Old and New Testament, and the sanctifier of souls. The immortality of the soul, man's free will, future reward and punishment according to each one's deeds. The existence of good and bad angels, the former assisting man in the work of salvation and the latter tempting him to evil. The creation of the world, its beginning in time, and its future ruin. The inspiration of Scripture, and its having both a literal and a spiritual meaning.

Questions still open for discussion are the following: Is

the Holy Ghost begotten (originated? created?) or not? Is He also the Son of God? Does the soul come *ex traduce seminis?* Are the demons fallen angels? What was there before the world was created? And what shall there be after it has ceased to exist? When were the angels created? Are God and spirits without a body? And in what sense? Have stars souls or not?

According to his plan of work, then, it is the authorized teaching of the Church on which his theological synthesis is to rest. If, in obedience to the precept, "Enlighten yourself with the lamp of knowledge," a doctrinal compendium is to be drawn up, rationally designed as an organic whole, here are the elements which must be knit together as a solid foundation. Make use of clear and indisputable inference; draw from Holy Scripture whatever can be found there or deduced from it; consult the certain teaching of the living Church; and then from all these various sources form one single body of doctrine.

This is truly an excellent plan, none more serviceable could well be devised; but in the hands of Origen, owing largely to his allegorical interpretation of Scripture, it yielded at times rather unsatisfactory results. In passing it may be noted, that this doctrinal compendium was not intended for simple believers, but for scholars who were familiar with the speculations of the Gnostics and non-Christian philosophers. It was meant to be an antidote against the various errors of the day, which threatened to lead astray some of the more studious among the flock of Christ.

The body of the work is divided into four books. In the first book the author treats of God, His oneness and spirituality, of the Logos and the Holy Spirit, and of the angels. In the second he takes up the study of the world, of mankind, of redemption through Christ, of the end of creation and the last things. In the third he investigates the freedom of man's will, the struggle between good and evil, the beginning of the world in time and its final consummation. In the fourth he explains his views on inspiration and exegesis. In most instances particular articles of the faith are first briefly stated,

then philosophically examined, and finally proved by arguments drawn chiefly from Holy Scripture.

The development may be sketched in a few lines. God is essentially one, unchangeable, and good. Because of His goodness, He must reveal and communicate Himself; because of His unchangeableness, He must reveal and communicate Himself from all eternity; because of His essential oneness, He can directly do neither the one nor the other: therefore He needs a minister of creation and revelation. This minister is the Word, begotten of the substance of the Father, coeternal and consubstantial with Him. Being consubstantial with the Father, the Word is true God; but being also capable of coming into direct contact with the relative and the manifold, He is in some way inferior to the Father. He is true God, but not *the* God.

The Holy Ghost is thus obviously outside the scope of the author's reasoning, but forced by Holy Scripture and the teaching of the Church he brings Him into the exposition of his system, associating Him with the Father and the Son in one trinity of divine persons. Apparently, however, this Trinity corresponds but imperfectly with the true Christian concept of the mystery. All three persons are indeed said to be truly divine, but at the same time they are represented as if they were unequal in perfection, and are certainly conceived to be dissimilar in their sphere of action. "God the Father, holding all things together, reaches to each of the things that are, imparting being to each from His own; for He is absolutely. Compared with the Father the Son is less, reaching to rational things only, for He is second to the Father. And the Holy Ghost again is inferior, extending His operation to the saints only. So that in this respect the power of the Father is greater, in comparison with the Son and the Holy Spirit; and the power of the Son more, in comparison with the Holy Spirit; and again the power of the Holy Spirit more exceeding, in comparison with all other holy beings." [36]

Again, because God is essentially good and at the same time

[36] De Princ. 1, 3, 5.

essentially unchangeable, and omnipotent from all eternity, hence eternal creation must be admitted. But as matter cannot be eternal, it follows that spiritual beings were created first. They were endowed with freedom of choice, but abused it almost immediately and fell into sin. Then the material world was created, in order to subject the fallen spirits to a purifying discipline. They were then imprisoned in bodies, more or less gross in proportion to the gravity of their sin. Thus the bodies of angels are ethereal, those of men simply material, whilst the bodies of demons are "grotesque and horrible."

To assist men in their temptations and struggles, to which this purifying discipline gives rise, the Word sent them Prophets in the days of old, and finally Himself assumed human nature, perfect in body and pure in soul, and through His sufferings and death wrought the redemption of all. This redemption, however, although it is truly a payment of our debt and an emancipation from the power of Satan, does not primarily effect an elevation of our nature to a divine sphere; it removes obstacles, strengthens by example, and enlightens by the infusion of a higher knowledge.

The end of all things implies a universal restoration, an *apokatastasis,* when all reasonable beings, having repented of their faults under the chastising hand of God, shall be reconciled to their Maker. Yet as they still remain free, it is possible that they may fall again, and thus be forced to begin once more the cycle of purification.

Finally, Holy Scripture, whence our knowledge of revealed truths is chiefly drawn, has a triple sense: somatic, psychic, and pneumatic. The first of these is the literal and historical meaning of the text, intended for the simple. The second is spiritual, and is meant for those who have already somewhat advanced in the appreciation and understanding of divine truths. The third is mystic, and is for the perfect. There are many passages in the Old Testament, and also some in the New, that have no literal meaning; they must be interpreted in a spiritual sense. Hence the allegorical interpretation of Scripture is not only justified, but becomes a matter

of necessity. In fact, Holy Scripture, like all visible creation, is but symbol of the invisible things of God. It is only the spiritually enlightened who can interpret it aright.

From this brief outline of the treatise it is sufficiently clear that the author's intention of building upon the solid foundation of Holy Scripture and approved tradition was not altogether realized. In fact, on several points he went decidedly astray; and one is not surprised that his bishop on account of doctrines here set forth, as is probable, should have removed him from his post of head-master in the catechetical school of Alexandria. But in passing judgment on him, two things must be borne in mind. The first is, as already stated above, that he intended his treatise as a counterpoise to the teaching of the Gnostics, trying to show by philosophical argumentation the unreasonableness of Dualism, Emanationism, and Docetism; and in this he succeeded admirably. The second is that he sincerely endeavored to safeguard the traditional teaching of the Church, and as a consequence wherever he simply states doctrines to be admitted by all, he is usually quite orthodox. Only where he explains points which to his way of looking at them had not yet been determined by any authorized teaching, whether of Scripture or tradition, does he allow himself to be carried to extremes. Hence whilst he is an unsafe teacher, he is still a reliable witness.

Furthermore, as judged by what he says in his other extant works, his commentaries on Holy Scripture, his treatise *Contra Celsum,* and his tractate *On Prayer,* he appears in a somewhat different light. Thus, commenting on Romans, 9, 5, where the Apostle says that Christ "is over all things, God blessed forever," he speaks of the Trinity in a perfectly orthodox sense. "Both (the Father and the Son) are one God, because the Son has no other source of divinity than the Father; but, as Wisdom says, the Son is a most pure emanation of the one paternal fountain. Therefore Christ is over all things God. But He who is over all things, has no one over Himself. For He is not below the Father, but of the Father. And this very same has the Wisdom of God given us to understand of the Holy Spirit, when it says: 'The Spirit of the Lord hath

filled the whole world, and that which containeth all things hath knowledge of the voice.' If, therefore, the Son is called God over all, and the Holy Spirit is said to contain all, and the Father is He of whom all have their being, it is shown to evidence that the nature of the Trinity and the substance is one, and this is over all." [37]

Again, in a fragment of his commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews he says that the Son is begotten of the substance of the Father, that He is *homoousios* with the Father, that there was never an instant when He was not the Son.[38] In all this the author clearly anticipates the definition of Nicæa.

In Christ he clearly distinguishes between the two natures, the divine and the human. "In the first place it behooves us to know, that in Christ the nature of His divinity, by reason of which He is the only-begotten Son of the Father, is one thing, and another is His human nature, which He assumed in these latter times according to the divine dispensation." [39] Yet, though the two natures are distinct, they are not separate, but are so intimately conjoined in the unity of person, that the properties of the one can in the concrete be predicated of the other. Hence it is that the human nature, as united to the divinity, "is justly called the Son and the Power of God, Christ and the Wisdom of God; and again the Son of God, through whom all things were created, is styled Jesus Christ and the Son of man. For the Son of God also is said to have died, in that nature, of course, which was capable of being affected by death; and He is called the Son of man, who, according to the teaching of faith, shall come with the holy angels in the glory of the Father. And for this reason, throughout the whole Scripture, the divine nature is designated by terms applicable to human beings, and the human nature is honored with divine appellations." [40] Thus the author gives a perfectly correct application of the *communicatio idiomatum,* which is based upon the hypostatic union.

The object of Christ's coming into the world was the redemption of mankind. "For the people did this man die,

[37] In Rom. 7, 13.
[38] P. G. 14, 1308, 1307.
[39] De Princ. 1, 2, 1.
[40] Ibid. 1, 2, 10.

who was purer than all living beings; He bore our sins and infirmities, as He was able to pay for and to destroy and to blot out all the sins of the whole world taken upon Himself, because He had done no inquity, nor was deceit found in His mouth, nor did He know sin."[41] Hence Christ's satisfaction was vicarious. It was also a propitiatory sacrifice, the Saviour of the world offering Himself as a victim of propitiation to His Father.[42] Then, along with this perfectly orthodox view, the author develops the idea of a ransom being paid to the evil one, so that we might be justly freed from the slavery of Satan.[43] The redemption is universal in the widest sense of the term, extending not only to the whole human race, but likewise to all other reasonable beings.[44]

Freed from sin by the redemption thus wrought, men must work out their salvation by making a good use of their free will and the graces bestowed upon them by God. In this they are assisted by the Church of Christ. The author's ecclesiology appears to be quite orthodox. The Church, he says, is one all over the world, and no person is a true Christian unless he belongs to the Church which takes its name from Christ.[45] Out of the Church there is no salvation, and if any one separates himself from her communion, he is guilty of his own destruction.[46] Christ built His Church upon Peter, who is its solid foundation.[47] The faithful are under the jurisdiction of the bishop, who is assisted by priests and deacons.[48]

Of baptism he says that it washes away all sins, and as little children are also sinners, the Church, following Apostolic tradition, teaches that they should be baptized.[49] The baptism of water may, however, be supplied by martyrdom, which is the baptism of blood.[50]

The author touches the question of penance in several different places, but his position is not altogether clear. In his treatise *Contra Celsum,* he indicates the general rule followed

[41] In Joan. 28, 18 (160).
[42] In Rom. 3, 8.
[43] In Matt. 16, 18.
[44] In Joan. 1, 40.
[45] Contr. Celsum, 8, 16.
[46] In Jesu Nave, Hom. 3, 5.
[47] In Exod. 5, 4.
[48] De Orat. 28, 4; cfr. Contr. Cels. 3, 51.
[49] In Rom. 5, 9; In Joan. 6, 17.
[50] Exhort. ad Mart. 30, 34, 50.

by the Christians in regard to those who sin grievously. "Those," he says, "who fall into sin, and especially such as give themselves up to licentiousness, the Christians separate from their communion. . . . They mourn as lost and dead to God those who have fallen through lust or who have committed any other crime; and they regard them as having been raised from the dead, when they have so changed their ways that they deserve readmission. However, they are admitted less readily than those who are received for the first time; and because they have fallen after pledging their fidelity to the principles of our religion, they are forbidden to hold any place of honor and superiority in the said Church of God." [51]

In another place he enumerates several kinds of penance; one of which, he says, is more laborious than the rest, because it includes the confession of sins that have been committed.[52] And this confession is to be made to the priests of the Church, who, in imitation of their Master, impart to the people the forgiveness of their sins.[53] To the priests it also belongs to determine whether public penance should be performed for the sins confessed to them.[54] However, although the ministry of forgiveness belongs to all the priests, it does so more particularly to the bishop.[55] Sins that must be confessed are divided into mortal faults and mortal crimes. For the former one can always obtain pardon; as regards the latter, the author is apparently not consistent in his views. In one place he expresses his astonishment that priests should presume to pardon any of them, that is, apostasy, homicide, and adultery.[56] In another he states that deliberate and full apostasy is unpardonable.[57] In a third he holds that pardon may be granted once.[58] And finally in a fourth place he implies that they may be pardoned repeatedly.[59]

Anent this apparent contradiction, Tixeront gives it as his opinion that "Origen, as well as Tertullian, regarded the

[51] Cont. Cels. 3, 51.
[52] In Levit. Hom. 2, 4.
[53] In Levit. 5, 3; cfr. Ibid. 3, 4.
[54] In Num. Hom. 10, 1.
[55] In Levit. 15, 2; cfr. De Orat. 28.
[56] Ibid. 28.
[57] In Matt. 114.
[58] In Levit. 15, 2.
[59] Ibid. 11, 2.

crimina mortalia as beyond forgiveness: but he has been corrected in this point, as in many others." [60] Practically the same view is taken by Rauschen,[61] and many other modern critics. D'Alès, on the other hand, and perhaps the majority of dogmatic theologians contend that the contradiction is only apparent, and that, "when Origen speaks of unpardonable sins in his *De Oratione,* he does not imply that they are unpardonable *in se,* but unpardonable on account of the malice of unrepentant sinners or the laxity of priests who fail to dispose them to penance." [62] All things considered, this appears to be the more probable view.

Origen's teaching on the Eucharist is in the main quite satisfactory. He speaks of the consecrated elements as containing the real body and blood of Christ, which, he says, the faithful receive with the greatest care and reverence, lest some particles should fall to the ground; and if this were to happen through their own fault, he adds, they would be guilty indeed. They do not take so much care in preserving the word of God.[63] In another place he states that besides this common understanding of the Eucharist, one may also take a spiritual view of it, according to which the consecrated elements are symbols of the teaching of Christ.[64] He also holds that the Eucharist is a true sacrifice. The Christian altar, he says, is not flowing with the blood of animals, but is consecrated by the precious blood of Jesus Christ.[65] The material elements are consecrated by the "prolatum verbum," and it is from this that the sanctifying power of the Eucharist is derived.[66]

In his references to matrimony, the author stands for the indissolubility of the marriage bond, proving his view from the teaching of Holy Scripture.[67] He remarks, however, that some "Ecclesiæ rectores" have occasionally allowed persons to act contrary to this teaching; but, he adds, they did so most likely in order to avoid a greater evil.[68] It is God who unites

[60] O. c. 278.
[61] Eucharist and Penance, 180 sq.
[62] L'Édit de Calliste; La Théologie de S. Hippolyte, 44 sq.
[63] In Exod. Hom. 13, 3.
[64] Ibid. 13, 3, 5.
[65] In Num. Hom. 24, 1; In Jesu Nave, 2, 1; 8, 6.
[66] In Matt. 11, 14.
[67] Ibid. 14, 23.
[68] Ibid.

husband and wife, so that they are no longer two but one; and because it is God who unites them, therefore the union is to them a source of grace.[69]

As a reason for the baptism of little children, as was said above, the author adduces the fact that they too are sinners. This would seem to imply his belief in the existence of original sin. The same inference may be drawn from several other statements. Thus he holds that the soul on its union with the body contracts a moral stain, because it is united to a body of sin.[70] And in his commentary on the Epistle to the Romans he argues that as Adam begot his first child only after he had committed sin, he necessarily transmitted a sin-stained body; and as all men were contained in Adam whilst dwelling in paradise, so were they all with him and in him expelled therefrom, all being subject to the consequences of that first sin.[71]

Many other points of orthodox teaching might be gathered from the author's writings, but these are sufficient for our purpose. It is indeed easy enough to draw up from his various works, especially from his *De Principiis*, a long list of propositions that deserve the severest censure, as was actually done some three hundred years after his death; but it is not less easy to make him a staunch defender of orthodox Christianity as it existed in his day. He unhesitatingly accepted the teaching of the Church, whether it was drawn from oral tradition or from the written word, but beyond its obvious and literal meaning, which he had no intention of setting aside, he sought for a higher spiritual sense, which would give him a deeper insight into the mysteries of God. In this his allegorizing tendency carried him at times too far; still it must not be forgotten that the conclusions thus arrived at were not meant to supplant the Church's ordinary teaching as it was explained to the simple. Thus when he says that the Holy Eucharist is the real body and blood of the Saviour, he understands and accepts the proposition in its literal sense; but the

[69] Ibid. 14, 16.
[70] In Levit. 8, 3; In Luc. Hom. 14.
[71] In Rom. 5, 9; 1, 1; cfr. Contr. Cels. 3, 62, 66.

reality of the Saviour's presence is to him at the same time a symbol of God's loving and merciful revelation to men, and so he does not hesitate to speak of the Eucharist as the word of God. If this be borne in mind, most of Origen's alleged aberrations, at least in matters which were then clearly taught by the Church, will disappear.

CHAPTER XIII

FROM THE DEATH OF ORIGEN TO THE COUNCIL OF NICÆA

Between the close of Origen's troubled and brilliant career and the opening of the Council of Nicæa, nearly three-quarters of a century later, no theologian of particular eminence appeared of whom we have any record. This is especially true of the West. Cyprian died in 258, and his immediate successors have left us nothing that is worthy of note. There were indeed a few writers, like Arnobius, Commodian, Lactantius, and Victorinus of Pettau, who employed their literary talents in defense of the faith or in the exposition of Christian doctrine, but they added nothing to what had already been accomplished by those who went before them. Arnobius was a recent convert and apparently but poorly instructed in the faith which he tried to defend; Commodian, probably a Jewish proselyte before his conversion to Christianity, was a poet, who appealed to his readers' imagination rather than to their reason; Lactantius, the Christian Cicero, was more skilful in discomfiting his pagan adversaries than in enlightening his fellow-believers; whilst Victorinus of Pettau confined himself almost exclusively to Scriptural exegesis, and of his many works only his commentary on the Apocalypse has come down to us. Hence about them nothing need be said in the History of Dogmas.

The East indeed produced some men of note, but even the best of them can hardly be compared with the writers of the first half of the third century. Some of these men, as Heraclas, Dionysius, Theognastus, Pierius, and Peter of Alexandria, succeeded Origen in the direction of the Alexandrian school, and likely enough they were quite competent as teachers; but with one or two exceptions, the few fragments of their works that are still extant give no indication of par-

ticular ability. Others, like Gregory Thaumaturgus, Methodius of Olympus, and Hieracas of Leontopolis, were constantly engaged in the discharge of their pastoral duties and had but little opportunity of accomplishing anything noteworthy along the lines of literary pursuits. Still in what remains of the works of these various writers, there are some points worth gathering; especially in the matter of Trinitarian and Christological teaching.

We may begin with Dionysius, who from the head-mastership of the catechetical school was raised to the episcopal see of Alexandria. He is best known to us from his correspondence with his namesake, the Bishop of Rome. In a letter written to refute the error of Sabellius, he used expressions which seemed to deny the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father. On account of this he was denounced to the Pope, and by him was called upon to clear himself of the charge of heterodox teaching. The Pope's letter itself contains a point worth noticing. After condemning those who identify the person of the Son with that of the Father, as Sabellius did, and those others who would make the Son a creature, as was afterwards done by Arius, he sets forth the teaching of the Church in the following terms: "We must neither divide the wonderful and divine Monad into three divinities, nor destroy the dignity and exceeding greatness of the Lord by considering Him a creature: but we must have faith in God the Father Almighty, and in Christ Jesus His Son, and in the Holy Ghost, and in the union of the Word with the God of the universe, 'for the Father and I,' He says, 'are but one, and I am in the Father and the Father is in me.' Thus both the Trinity and the holy preaching of the Monarchy will be safeguarded."[1] This is truly a precious relic of third-century theology, representing as it does the faith of the West in the Trinity and the divine sonship, and being at the same time a precise statement of the faith by the Head of the Church.

The answer of the bishop of Alexandria is also quite satis-

[1] Athanasius, De Decret. Nic. Syn. 15, 23.

factory. After calling attention to the fact that examples and comparisons may be strained beyond the limits of truth, and thus be made to imply what was never intended by the author, he says: "There never was a time when God was not Father. . . . And as the Son is the Splendor of Eternal Light, so He Himself also is strictly eternal. As the word in the mind is distinct from the mind, and yet one with it, the one being in the other; so too the Father and the Son, although distinct, are one." [2] And to the charge that he had not used the term *homoousios,* consubstantial, when speaking of the Son, he replies, that the omission resulted not from his denying the applicability of the term to the Son, but simply from his not having found it in Holy Scripture.[3] Then the other charge, that he makes the three hypostases or persons so many portions of the Godhead, he answers by saying: "Three there are though they (the adversaries) like it not, or they must utterly destroy the Divine Trinity. We extend the Monad indivisibly into the Triad, and conversely gather together the Triad without diminution into the Monad." [4] This perfectly satisfied the Pope, because it was thoroughly orthodox.

The same doctrine is found in the few fragments of the work of Theognastus, preserved by St. Athanasius. Although there are some traces of Subordinationism, yet when speaking of the generation of the Son, the author says that the Son is born of the substance of the Father, an expression that found its way into the Nicene Creed. He also insists strongly on the Son's full and perfect likeness in essence to the Father.[5]

St. Gregory Thaumaturgus is even more explicit. In his *Exposition of the Faith* he has expressions like the following: "One God, Father of the Living Word . . . perfect progenitor of a perfect offspring, Father of the only-begotten Son. One Lord, God of God, figure and image of the Godhead, the Word, creator of all things; true Son of true God. And one Holy Spirit, who has His substance from God, and who through the Son appeared to men; the perfect

[2] Id. De Sent. Dionys. 15, 23.
[3] Ibid. 18.
[4] Ibid. 17.
[5] Id. De Decret. Nic. Syn. 25.

image of the Son, the life and cause of all life. A perfect trinity, not divided nor separated in glory and eternity and rule. Nor is there anything created or in servitude in the Trinity; nor anything superinduced, as if first not there and then added thereto. And thus neither was the Son ever wanting to the Father, nor the Spirit to the Son; but without variation and without change, the same Trinity ever abideth." [6] Bearing in mind that Gregory was a disciple and ardent admirer of Origen, the latter's teaching on the Trinity may perhaps appear in a somewhat new light; for it is hardly conceivable that the devoted disciple should be so correct, if the master had gone altogether astray.

St. Peter of Alexandria is noted chiefly for his opposition to Origen. He severely censures the latter's teaching on the preëxistence of souls, and on their union with a body in consequence of sin. He also finds fault with Origen's doctrine on the resurrection, as not sufficiently safeguarding the identity of the risen body with that which each one had during life. These strictures are just enough if no allowance be made for Origen's philosophical speculations, as was pointed out in the preceding chapter. Christ, according to Peter's teaching, was God by nature, and became man by nature. In the Incarnation the Word became true man, but He did not lay aside His divinity.[7]

St. Methodius of Olympus finds the same fault with Origen. Man was eternally with God, he says, as a possible being; as something that might be called into existence, but he was wholly created in time.[8] Man is a sort of microcosm, summing up the whole world in himself.[9] He was endowed by His Creator with freedom and immortality, and made to the likeness of God.[10] Adam fell, and as a consequence we are all inclined to sin. "When man was deceived by the devil, he violated the commandment of God, and thenceforth sin, propagated by this contumacy, took up its abode in him. . . . For deprived of the divine gifts and utterly pros-

[6] P. G. 10, 983–988.
[7] Fragm. P. G. 18, 512, 521, 509.
[8] De Lib. Arbitr. 22, 9–11.
[9] De Res. 2, 10, 2.
[10] Ibid. 1, 38, 3; 35, 2.

trated, we have become a prey to concupiscence, which the cunning serpent and shrewd deceiver excited in us." [11] To remedy the evil thus introduced into the world, the Word of God became incarnate, being at the same time true God and true man.[12] He was the second Adam, the representative of the human race, who laid down his life for the sins of the world.[13] The fruit of His redemption is treasured up in the Church, His spouse and the mother of His children.[14] These children are born to Him in baptism, which makes the recipients so many other Christs.[15]

Besides these fragments, there is an anonymous treatise belonging to this period, entitled, *On the Right Faith,* which was formerly ascribed to Origen. It was directed against the Marcian and Valentinian heresies, but incidentally gives also an exposition of Catholic doctrines. The author, who calls himself Adamantius, professes his faith in the eternal and consubstantial Word, and in the Holy Spirit, who is also eternal.[16] The Word, he says, is Son of God by nature, whilst men are children of God only by adoption.[17] He remained truly God in the Incarnation, but also truly assumed flesh from the Virgin Mary.[18] The Catholic Church, he states in another place, is the sole depository of truth, and those who leave her communion necessarily fall into error. True Christians are called Catholics because they are spread all over the world.[19] There is also a reference to the Holy Eucharist, which the author calls the communion of the body and blood of Christ.[20] Like St. Irenæus before him, he adduces the Real Presence as an argument against the Valentinians, who held that matter was essentially evil.

A few other points of interest might be gathered from the scattered fragments belonging to this period, but these will suffice for our purpose. They are only few in number, but

[11] Epiphan. Adv. Haeres. 64, 60; cfr. De Lib. Arb. 17, 4, 5.
[12] Banquet, 1, 5; 8, 7; 3, 5.
[13] Ibid. 3, 3, 4, 5, 8; De Res. 3, 23, 11.
[14] Banquet, 3, 8.
[15] Ibid. 8, 6, 8; 8, 9, 8.
[16] De Recta Fide, 1, 2.
[17] Ibid. 3, 9.
[18] Ibid. 5, 39; 4, 15; 5, 7.
[19] Ibid. 5, 28; 1, 8.
[20] Ibid. 2, 20.

of inestimable value. They present to us in the clearest possible light the faith of both East and West on two points of doctrine which a quarter of a century later were to stir the Christian world to its very depths. Their preservation appears truly providential.

As the present chapter concludes our review of Antenicene theology, it seems in place here to say a word about doctrinal development as referred to this particular period of time. Was there any real progress in the Church's teaching since the days of the Apostolic Fathers? Was there anything like development in her theology? Or did she simply hand down from generation to generation what she had received from the Apostles and their immediate successors in the days of old?

Both of these questions may be answered in the affirmative, but each under a different aspect. The Church simply handed down what she had received in so far as the contents of her doctrines came in question: the deposit of faith remained ever the same. Nothing is found in the orthodox writers of the third century that was not in some way implied or referred to by the men who wrote at the beginning of the second. Under this aspect there was no development. But the matter looks quite different when the explicit presentation and precise exposition of particular doctrines are considered. Then there is noticeable a progress and development that becomes ever more striking as time passes on. This is especially true in reference to the Blessed Trinity, the true Godhead of the Son, the unity of person and duality of natures in Christ, the constitution of the Church and her importance in the economy of salvation, the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the Eucharist, the sacrificial character of the Eucharistic rite, and the nature of the Church's intervention in the remission of post-baptismal sins.

To realize this, one need but compare the somewhat vague association of the Son and the Holy Ghost with the Father, as found in sub-Apostolic writers, with the precise Trinitarian formula worked out by Tertullian and freely used by Dionysius of Rome and his namesake of Alexandria. Or the indefinite expression Son of God, as implying the divinity of Christ,

with the explicit declaration of the Son's consubstantiality made by these same authors. Or, again, the simple statement of earlier writers that the Word became man with the definite teaching of third-century authors that the Word Incarnate is one person subsisting in two natures. And so all along the various lines of theological thought as indicated above. Nothing was added, nothing was taken away, but what was ever present gradually crystallized into clearer concepts and expanded into fuller statements. There was indeed no change, but there was growth.

And the same is more or less true of other points of doctrine. The veneration of martyrs, sacrifice and prayers for the dead, the Divine Motherhood of the Virgin, all at first referred to in a somewhat casual way, were by the end of the third century universally accepted as evidently contained in the authorized teaching of the Church. By that time also the New Testament canon was practically fixed, and the inspiration of Holy Scripture was placed beyond dispute.

There appears a similar progress in the manifest recognition of the Primacy of Rome. Merely implied in the Prima Clementis, and more or less incidentally referred to in the letter of Ignatius to the Romans, the fact of the Primacy is definitely stated by Irenæus and Cyprian, and the rights involved therein are unhesitatingly exercised by successive Popes. The position taken by Victor in the paschal dispute, by Callistus in the matter of penance, by Stephen in the baptismal controversy, and by Dionysius in reference to his namesake of Alexandria, shows how thoroughly these Pontiffs were convinced that as successors of St. Peter they had at once the right and the duty to feed the whole flock of Christ. And although at times, in the heat of controversy, the Pope's authority was apparently disregarded by individuals, nevertheless the Christian world as a whole was always ready to acknowledge the universal jurisdiction of the incumbent of the Roman see. For that see was to them the see of Peter, and the Pope was admitted to be Peter's successor. Hence the well attested historical fact, that not only orthodox bishops and teachers, but heresiarchs as well, ever sought to strengthen

their position by endeavoring to obtain the support of Rome. They well knew that communion with Rome was universally regarded as communion with the Church of Christ. There was as yet little or no theorizing about the Pope's Primacy, but as a mere fact that Primacy was well understood and readily admitted.

And thus without the intervention of general councils, without any formal definition of the faith issued by the Head of the Church, the ordinary *magisterium*, guided by the Spirit of truth and watched over by the Vicar of Christ, not only warded off all dangers from the preaching of God's word, but also directed orthodox teaching with a firm hand along the ever lengthening lines of legitimate doctrinal development. In the following periods we shall see this development proceed more rapidly, owing to the rise of wide-spread heresies and the consequent decisive action of general councils; but the final outcome will ever be the same.

CHAPTER XIV

RISE OF THE ARIAN HERESY AND THE COUNCIL OF NICÆA[1]

During a period of more than forty years, from 260, when the Valerian persecution ended, to 302, when that of Diocletian began, the Church enjoyed not only peace but practically full liberty to preach the Gospel throughout the vast extent of the Roman Empire. As a result the number of Christians increased rapidly, and the development of Church organization went on apace. Harnack estimates that at the beginning of the fourth century there were about four million believers, who were presided over by something like fifteen hundred bishops. This, of course, is only an estimate, and the actual number of Christians was probably much larger. Asia Minor, Armenia, Syria, Palestine, Northern Egypt, Proconsular Africa and Numidia, Central and Lower Italy, Southern Gaul and some parts of Spain, were almost entirely Christian. Believers in the Gospel message were much more numerous in cities than in the country districts, and many of them belonged to the highest classes of society.

This freedom of religious practice and worship led naturally to a more perfect organization of Church government. From the earliest times local churches had been governed by a hierarchy which consisted of three orders, bishops, priests, and deacons, to which towards the middle of the third century subdeacons and clerics in the four minor orders were added. This arrangement remained unchanged, but these local churches were gradually drawn more closely together as free

[1] Cfr. Newman, The Arians of the Fourth Century; Rogala, Die Anfaenge des Arianishen Streites; Tixeront, H. D. II, 29–36; Schwane, H. D. I, 207–219, II, 134–232; Hefele, History of the Councils, I, 231–449, Engl. Trans. 2nd Edit.; Hergenroether, Kirchengeschichte, I, 348–384; Marion, Histoire de l'Eglise, I, 395–424.

communication became established. Up to the fourth century they were usually grouped around their respective mother-churches, from which they had received the faith; but later on, first in the East and then also in the West, there was a division into provinces, each being subject to a metropolitan, who exercised a certain amount of directive authority over his suffragan bishops. In the East he usually had his residence in the capital city of the corresponding political division, whilst in the West this was rarely the case. Finally, all these churches looked to Rome as the center of unity, and in matters of extraordinary difficulty, which could not be settled by the authority of provincial councils, the Apostolic See was commonly considered as the court of last appeal.

Whilst the Church was thus peacefully carrying on her mission, there burst upon her the last and in some respect the most violent persecution. With occasional lulls and intermissions, the storm raged for nine long years; and when finally peace was restored, the Church's fairest provinces lay in ruin. Not only had thousands of Christians been slaughtered, but many also had proved untrue to their faith, having either offered sacrifices to the idols or bought written testimonials stating that they had done so. These were called respectively *sacrificati* and *libellatici,* whilst others who had surrendered the Sacred Writings were termed *traditores.* It was the work of reconciling these unfaithful children, grown careless during long years of peace, that awaited the Church when she finally emerged from the storm and was permanently liberated from pagan domination by the joint action of Licinius and Constantine. She undertook it as she had undertaken similar work many a time before, with loving patience and merciful kindness; but before she had healed the wounds struck by the terrible persecution, another storm burst upon her that was to prove almost more dangerous than the fury of pagan tyrants. This was the Arian heresy.

A — Rise of the Arian Heresy

Arius seems to have been of Libyan origin, and was born shortly after the middle of the third century. He received

his early training at Antioch, where he frequented the school of Lucian. This latter was a somewhat erratic genius, and on account of his heterodox Christological views he incurred the censures of the Church, but he was later on restored to her communion and died a martyr's death. After the completion of his studies, Arius was received among the Alexandrian clergy. Though for some time excommunicated on account of the part he took in the Meletian schism, he was eventually ordained priest by bishop Achillas, whose successor, Alexander, placed him in charge of Baucalis, one of the several parish churches of the city. Here he soon gained a considerable following, both by reason of his ascetic life, his dignified bearing, and his keen logic. It was whilst in charge of this church that he first broached his heretical views, but authors do not agree in relating the particular circumstances that caused him to take this step. When called to account by his bishop, he refused to retract or correct his heterodox statements, being assured of the support of his many followers. And so the troubles began which were to disturb the Eastern Church for nearly a hundred years.

At the root and center of the conflict was the old Christological problem with the solution of which the minds of learned men had been occupied for many years past. If there be but one true God, how can Jesus Christ be truly divine? In what precise sense, therefore, is Jesus the Son of God? Or as believing Christians would prefer to put it: As Jesus Christ is true God, and as the Father is true God, and as there is only one true God, what precise relation does Jesus Christ bear to the Father? Christian antiquity had always answered in rather general terms: Jesus Christ is the only Son of God, begotten from all eternity by the Father, and therefore true God; but how this can be reconciled with the absolute oneness of the Godhead, is a mystery that must be accepted on the authority of God's word. "Whoso wish to explain it are out of their minds." From the standpoint of faith this answer was quite satisfactory, but it did not satisfy those whose philosophical bent led them to look for the ultimate reasons of things. Hence many explanations were attempted, some more

or less orthodox, others obviously heretical. Here are a few of them, a brief statement of which will at the same time serve to point out the intellectual genesis of Arianism.

The second century Apologists admitted the eternal generation of the Word and staunchly defended both His personal distinction from the Father and His true divinity; but by way of explanation they postulated, at least as far as the wording goes, a certain subordination of the Word to the Father and a temporal "bringing forth" in view of the creative work. The Adoptionists (190) and Paul of Samosata (268) cut the Gordian knot by considering the Word to be impersonal, a merely outward aspect of the one God in His relation to the external world. Jesus, therefore, as they regarded Him, was purely human, a holy man, in whom dwelt permanently the impersonal Word of God. On account of His great merit He was adopted by the Father as His only Son, and as such He became entitled to special veneration. Hence for them there was no further Christological problem to be solved. The better to refute these heretics, some Catholic writers, among them those of the Alexandrian school, took over the Subordinationist expressions of the earlier Apologists and gave them a certain vogue, especially in the East. As a result, not a few Eastern bishops, whilst professing the true divinity of the Son, maintained at the same time that He was to be regarded as inferior to the Father. The Church meanwhile contented herself with defending the oneness of God against the pagans and the personal distinction of Father and Son against the Modalists, without as yet taking official cognizance of the Subordinationist tendencies that were at work.

When the ground had thus been slowly prepared for the seeds of heresy, Arianism took its rise. Its author chose an intermediate stand between the Adoptionists and the second-century Apologists. Against the former he defended the existence of a personal Word, and against the latter he denied the Word's true divinity and also His eternal generation. His teaching on the subject, as gathered from the few fragments of his works that still remain, may be reduced to the following points:

1°. God is absolutely transcendent and cannot communicate His essence; therefore He cannot have a Son in the strict sense of the term.

2°. As a necessary consequence, the Word is a creature, though altogether unique in perfection and position. There was a time when He was not, and He was made out of nothing, truly created.

3°. Yet because of His surpassing excellence and perfection, He was endowed with creative power and in time created the world, acting as the Father's instrument.

4°. He acted also as the agent of redemption, and for that purpose became incarnate in Jesus.

5°. Being a creature, He is subject to the Father, knows the Father only imperfectly, and during the time of His probation was, absolutely speaking, liable to fall into sin. Yet He served God faithfully in all things and thereby merited to be adopted as God's Son, in consequence of which adoption He is entitled to the veneration of men.[2]

In 320 Arius was cited before a synod of Egyptian and Libyan bishops, about a hundred in number. He appeared but refused to retract; whereupon he was excommunicated and after some time was expelled from the city. This, however, made him only the more zealous to spread his views. By letters to bishops and by tracts and songs written for the common people, he made propaganda for his cause in many parts of Palestine, Syria, and Asia Minor. To counteract these proselytizing efforts of Arius, and at the same time to justify his own action and that of his fellow-bishops, Alexander sent a circular letter to the various churches of the East, in which, after briefly summarizing the condemned errors, he set forth what he considered to be the traditional teaching of the Church concerning the matter in dispute. The following points may be noted:

1°. The Son is not created *ex nihilo,* but begotten by the Father from His own substance. He was begotten not in time, but from all eternity.

[2] Fragm. ex Thalia; fragm. ex Ep. ad Alex. P. G. 26, 21; 26, 705, 708.

2°. He is, therefore, not an adopted Son of the Father, but His Son by nature.

3°. The Father and the Son are inseparable in being, though distinct as persons. The Son is immutable, immortal, impeccable.

4°. The Father created the world through the Son, yet the Son is of the same substance as the Father.

5°. In all this there is a mystery, which we accept by faith, though we cannot fathom it by reason.[8]

Thus the traditional teaching of the Church and the obvious rejection of it by Arius were placed in a clear light; but the latter's influence with not a few bishops, who were more or less inclined to Subordinationism, made the quiet suppression of his teaching impossible. Hence another remedy was tried, hitherto unheard of, the intervention of a general council.

B — The Council of Nicæa

Whilst ecclesiastical and religious unity was thus seriously endangered, Constantine, by his victory over Licinius in 323, became sole ruler of the Empire. Heartily tired of wars and strifes, his first efforts on visiting his newly acquired Eastern dominions were directed towards bringing about an understanding between the contending parties. He was as yet only a catechumen, and in fact remained such until shortly before his death, still he considered himself as duly constituted "Episcopus in externis," and therefore entitled to exert his imperial power in trying to bring this annoying conflict to a close. With this object in view, he sent a letter to Alexander and Arius, bidding them to adjust their differences. As bearer of this imperial mandate, he selected Hosius, bishop of Cordova in Spain, whom he had for some years past employed as his ecclesiastical adviser. Hosius, however, soon found that this was not a matter that could be settled out of hand by the authority of the Emperor; and when he informed his master of this on his return, the latter determined that a general council should be summoned without delay.

[8] Socrates, Hist. Eccl. I, 6; Theodoret, Hist. Eccl. I, 3. P. G. 18, 548 sq.

As neither the contending parties nor the Pope made any objection, an invitation was sent to such bishops of the Empire as could be reached, and means of transportation were provided by the State. About 300 answered the summons, although tradition gives the total number as 318. These were mostly from Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt. From the West strictly so called only a few attended, but they seem to have been men of ability and of some importance. Pope Sylvester sent as his representatives the Roman presbyters Vitus and Vincent, Spain was represented by Hosius of Cordova, Gaul by Nicasius of Dijon, Calabria by the Metropolitan Mark, Pannonia by Domnus of Stridon, and Africa by Cæcilius of Carthage. Among those present were also several bishops who had suffered for the faith and still bore upon their persons the marks of conflict. There was Paul of Neocæsarea with his burnt hands, Amphion of Epiphania, one of whose eyes had been plucked out, the venerable Paphnutius also blind in one eye and lame from his long sufferings in the metal mines, and his companion Potamon who had endured the same tortures.

It was towards the middle of June, 325, that the bishops assembled in the great hall of the imperial palace at Nicæa in Bithynia. On the whole it was a venerable assembly, although not all the bishops gathered there were distinguished either for learning or for sanctity; nor were all of them entirely orthodox in their doctrinal views. In fact, Theonas of Marmarica and Secundus of Ptolmais, as the event showed, were in full accord with Arius, whilst Eusebius of Nicomedia, Theogonis of Nicæa, and Maris of Chalcedon, at least supported him in his opposition to Alexander. The Emperor himself was present in state, but he did not take part in the transactions of the Council, in so far as they touched matters of faith; nor did he interfere with freedom of discussion on either side. As the Acts have not been preserved, the mode of procedure cannot be established with any degree of certainty; nor is it certain who acted as president, although it is rather commonly assumed that this honor was conferred on

Hosius, who is also supposed to have been deputed by the Pope as his legate.

In order to understand at all the events that followed the dissolution of the Council, it is necessary here to call attention to the work which the assembled bishops were, in the first instance, expected to accomplish. They had not been summoned from distant parts of the Empire to decide whether Christ was true God. Nor even, assuming His true divinity, to define in what precisely His relation to the Father consisted. This latter point might, and in fact did come before the Council by way of supplement to its principal work; but it was not the main point at issue. The Council was summoned to decide the quarrel between Arius and Alexander; that is, to determine whether Arius had been justly condemned and deposed by his own bishop in view of his doctrinal position. This, as is obvious, necessitated an examination of the teaching of Arius by the assembled bishops, and this examination led to animated discussion; but at no stage of the deliberation was the true Godhead of Christ considered open for debate. Hence as soon as Arius openly avowed his views before the council, all further discussion was at an end. With the exception of his followers already mentioned, the bishops would not listen to such blasphemous utterances as that the Word was not truly Son of God, that He was not true God, that there had been a time when He did not exist; and hence the sentence passed upon Arius by his own bishop was not only sustained but explicitly confirmed. If this fact, so obvious from the fragmentary records we have of what took place, be overlooked, the Arian controversy can lead to only one conclusion, namely, that before the Council of Nicæa the true divinity of the Son and His eternal generation from the substance of the Father were not fundamental doctrines of the faith. And this conclusion is absolutely false, as appears quite clearly from what has been said on these points in the preceding chapters.

It was only when this main work, the condemnation of Arius as judged by his own teaching, was accomplished, and

the supplementary task of defining the orthodox faith in precise terms was undertaken, that a real difference of views manifested itself. As already mentioned, some of the assembled bishops were by no means learned men; others, although sufficiently versed in matters of faith, preferred to leave well enough alone; others again, whilst admitting the true divinity of the Son, were inclined to hold that He must be in some way subordinated to the Father, so as to save the absolute oneness of God and at the same time to avoid all appearance of Sabellianism. Hence when it was proposed to draw up a Creed which would make all subterfuge on the part of Arius and his followers impossible, there was considerable disagreement about the terms to be adopted. However, when Eusebius of Nicomedia submitted a symbol of faith that favored the views of Arius, it was promptly rejected. Another one substituted by Eusebius of Cæsarea was pronounced too vague in its phraseology to serve as a test of orthodoxy, although it seems that this was finally adopted, after such clauses had been inserted as would place the true divinity of the Son and His eternal generation in the clearest possible light. It reads as follows:

"We believe in one God the Father all-sovereign, maker of all things both visible and invisible. And in one Lord Jesus Christ the Son of God, the Only-Begotten of the Father, that is, of the essence of the Father, God of God, Light of Light, Very God of Very God; begotten and not made, consubstantial with the Father, by whom all was made, both the things that are in heaven and the things that are on earth: who for us men and for our salvation came down and was incarnate, became man, suffered, and rose again on the third day, ascended into heaven, and will come to judge the living and the dead. And in the Holy Ghost."

Then follow the anathemas, which not only sever Arius and his followers from the Christian communion, but also serve to elucidate the foregoing Creed. "And those that say there was a time when He was not, and before He was begotten He was not, and that He was made out of nothing, or assert that the Son of God is of another substance or essence, or

created, or capable of change or alteration, the Catholic Church anathematizes."

Those who objected to the wording of the Creed, found most fault with the term *homoousios,* consubstantial. This, however, was not so much on account of its meaning, because the phrases, "begotten of the essence of the Father," "Very God of Very God," are substantially synonymous with it; but there were extrinsic reasons against its insertion into the Creed that had considerable weight with many of the Eastern bishops. To begin with, it was not a Scriptural term, although the reality for which it stood was clearly enough contained in the Sacred Writings. Worse still, it had been the watchword of the Sabellians, who denied the personal distinction between the Father and the Son, and for that reason the term had been set aside by the Synod of Antioch some sixty years before. However, when it was pointed out that there was no need of defining the faith in Scriptural terms, that the synod of Antioch had found no fault with the term itself but only with the heterodox sense attached to it by Paul of Samosata, and that it provided a test of orthodoxy which admitted of no subterfuge on the part of Arian heretics, the majority yielded and consented to its insertion in the Creed. Thereupon the bishops, with the exception of Theonas and Secundus, subscribed their names. It is probable, however, that Eusebius of Nicomedia and other friends of Arius would not have done so had it not been for the determined attitude assumed by Constantine, who let it be clearly understood that the decision of the majority should be accepted. Arius, Theonas and Secundus were then banished to Illyricum.

Two other disputes were settled by the Council. Meletius of Lycopolis, a rigorist in the matter of penance, had caused a schism at Antioch and greatly disturbed the peace of the Church; for this he was deposed but was allowed to retain the name and title of bishop. Then the paschal dispute, dating from the end of the second century, was amicably adjusted, the bishop of Antioch and his Eastern colleagues consenting to conform to the custom prevailing at Alexandria and in the West.

Finally a number of disciplinary canons, twenty in all, were drawn up of which the following may be mentioned here as throwing some light on the trend of ecclesiastical legislation: (4) Bishops in each province are to be installed by all their colleagues; the installation must be confirmed by the metropolitan. (16) No bishop is allowed to receive or promote clerics who have deserted their own church. (5) The bishops of each province are urged to assemble twice a year in council, for the purpose of delivering judgment in cases of appeal. (15, 16) Bishops and priests are forbidden to transfer themselves from one church to another. (17) The clergy are forbidden to practice usury. (3) They must not keep under their roof any woman who may give cause for suspicion. (8) Novations shall be admitted to communion on their simple promise to accept Catholic dogmas and to hold communion with persons twice married and with apostates who have repented. (6, 7) The traditional rights and prerogatives of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem are confirmed, the position of the Bishop of Rome as Patriarch in the West being instanced as an example in this matter.

The Council was occupied with these various matters during a period of about two months and a half, and then the bishops returned to their several sees. Arianism had been officially condemned, but as subsequent events showed, peace had not been restored to the Church.

C — Some Fourth Century Theologians

As doctrinal development in Patristic times proceeded most rapidly during the century which intervened between the Council of Nicæa (325) and that of Ephesus (431), it seems in place here to give a short biographical notice of the theologians who chiefly contributed thereto, and whose names recur again and again in the following chapters. It will enable the reader to follow the trend of events more intelligently.

1°. *Eusebius of Cæsarea in Palestine (256-340).*—He was a friend and disciple of Pamphilus, head of the catechetical school at Cæsarea. In many respects the most learned man of his age, he was nevertheless but a shallow theologian.

Moreover his orthodoxy was justly suspected, as he supported Arius, fraternized with the Eusebians, rejected the *homoousios,* and was opposed to Athanasius. Principal works: *Chronicle, Ecclesiastical History, Praeparatio Evangelica, Demonstratio Evangelica, Contra Marcellum, Ecclesiastica Theologia.*

2. *St. Athanasius of Alexandria (295-373).*— Chief opponent of Arianism and "Standard Bearer of Orthodoxy." Of his early life nothing is known. He was ordained deacon in 319, accompanied his bishop, Alexander, to Nicæa in 325, and was consecrated Patriarch of Alexandria in 328. He was a man of considerable learning, of great holiness of life, and a powerful adversary of the Arians. The latter succeeded in having him banished five times, but he lived to see the decline of their faction.— Principal works: *Oratio de Incarnatione Verbi, De Decretis Nicænis, De Synodis, Epistolae IV a Serapionem, Vita Venerabilis Patris Nostri Antonii, Festal Letters, Contra Arianos.*

3°. *St. Cyril of Jerusalem (315–386).*— Ordained priest in 345, he became bishop of Jerusalem about 350. He was a staunch opponent of Arianism, but, most likely for prudential reasons, he never used the term *homoousios.* The Arians caused him to be exiled three times, once for eleven years; but he was reinstated in time to take part in the Council of Constantinople in 381.— Principal works: *Catecheses,* twenty-four in number, which contain an almost complete body of Christian doctrine.

4°. *St. Basil of Cæsarea in Cappadocia (331–379).*— First a monk, then a priest (346), and lastly metropolitan of Cæsarea (370). Distinguished as an exponent of orthodox teaching, famous as a prelate, and a man of deeds rather than of words, he was even during his life-time styled the Great. He bore a principal part in the work of pacification during the latter years of the Arian struggle.— Principal works: Five books *Contra Eunomium, De Spiritu Sancto,* about twenty-five *Homilies on the Hexaemeron and Psalms,* three *Canonical Letters, Rules for Ascetics, Liturgy.*

5°. *St. Gregory of Nazianzus, "the Theologian" (330–*

390).— He was an intimate friend of Basil, together with whom he received his literary education at Athens. Ordained priest by his own father (361), and consecrated bishop of Sasima by Basil (371), he was transferred to Constantinople in 379. Two years later, whilst the Second General Council was in session there, he resigned that see, and thereafter governed the Church of Nazianzus till his death in 390. Of a somewhat irresolute disposition, he was anything but practical. He is commonly regarded as one of the greatest orators of Christian antiquity.— Principal works: Forty-five *Orationes,* most of which bear upon the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity.

6°. *St. Gregory of Nyssa, brother of St. Basil (334–394).* — In 371, he was, much against his inclinations, consecrated bishop of Nyssa, "an insignificant town under the jurisdiction of Basil." Soon after deposed by the Eusebians, he led a wandering life till 379, when he was reinstated. He was one of the principal theologians at the Council of Constantinople in 381, and is regarded as the most diligent and versatile writer of his time. Though an able theologian, he was much more eminent as a philosopher. He cherished great admiration for Origen, and to some extent followed his teaching.— Principal works: *Catechesis, Twelve Books against Eunomius, Two Books against Apollinaris.* The first named work is an argumentative defense of the principal Christian doctrines, against Pagans, Jews, and Heretics.

7°. *Didymus the Blind (310–395).*— He had lost his sight when four years old, but by prayer, meditation, and close attention to the lectures given in the schools, he acquired extensive and accurate knowledge. For more than half a century he was director of the catechetical school at Alexandria. He was strongly influenced by the teaching of Origen, and fell into some of his errors. In the Fifth General Council (553), he was condemned together with Origen.— Principal works: *De Trinitate, De Spiritu Sancto.* The latter is considered to be the best treatise on the subject in Christian antiquity.

8°. *St. Epiphanius of Salamis (315–403).*— A Palestinian by birth, and for thirty years superior of a monastery at Eleutheropolis in Judæa, he was in 367 made bishop of

Salamis (Constantia) in Cyprus. His chief ambition seems to have been to be orthodox in the strictest sense of the term, and a great part of his life was spent in hunting up and refuting heretics.— Principal works: *Ancoratus* "the firmly anchored man," an exposition of the doctrine of the Trinity, and particularly of the Holy Ghost; *Panarion* or *Adversus Hæreses,* a catalogue and exposition of eighty heretical systems.

9°. *Diodorus of Tarsus in Cilicia (?–390).*— Belonging to one of the noblest families of Antioch, and singularly talented, he received a finished education in every branch of secular and sacred sciences. At first an ascetic and a friend of St. Basil, he was made bishop of Tarsus in 378. From 357 to 373, he was the chief supporter of orthodoxy at Antioch; but over-emphasizing certain tendencies of the Antiochene school, he sowed the seeds of Nestorianism.— Principal works: *Commentaries on Sacred Scripture.* Only a few fragments of his writings are extant.

10°. *St. John Chrysostom (344–407).*— He was born at Antioch of a wealthy family, and received his literary education from the famous rhetorician Libanius. Later on he studied the sacred sciences under Meletius, Patriarch of Antioch, and Diodorus of Tarsus. For some years he led an ascetical life, but was made priest in 386. After preaching for ten years with great success at Antioch, he was in 397 consecrated Patriarch of Constantinople. Twice banished from his see, he died in exile at Comana in Pontus. Though the first of orators, he holds but a secondary rank as a theologian.— Principal works: Most of his writings are Scriptural expositions in the form of homilies; 76 on Genesis, 60 on the Psalms, 90 on Matthew, 80 on John, and over 100 on the Epistles of St. Paul. To these must be added his beautiful treatise on the Priesthood, *De Sacerdotio* in six books; and a number of *Catecheses.*

11°. *St. Amphilochius of Iconium in Lycaonia (340–?).*— He was a cousin of Gregory of Nazianzus. He received a highly finished education under the direction of Libanius, and thereafter practiced law for some years at Constantinople.

In 374 he was consecrated bishop of Iconium and became metropolitan of Lycaonia. He was highly esteemed by St. Basil, with whom he effectively coöperated in defending the faith against the Arians. He wrote quite voluminously, but from the sixth century until a few years ago his writings attracted little attention.— Principal works: Of his many literary productions only eight *Orationes,* a letter *Ad Seleucum,* and some fragments remain.

12°. *Theodore of Mopsuestia in Cilicia (350–428).*— Born in affluence at Antioch, he enjoyed the advantages of a liberal education under Libanius, being a fellow student of John Chrysostom. He studied theology under Diodorus of Tarsus, was ordained priest in 383, and then threw himself heart and soul into the defense of orthodoxy against the Arians, Macedonians, and Apollinarians. In 392 he was consecrated bishop of Mopsuestia, and for more than a third of a century displayed great zeal and energy in the discharge of his pastoral duties. Unfortunately, in his Christological teaching he still further developed the erroneous views of Diodorus, and thus prepared the way for the Nestorian heresy. He was condemned in the Fifth General Council (553).— Principal works: *Commentaries on Sacred Scripture, Contra Eunomium,* a book on the *Mysteries, De Assumente et Assumpto.*

13°. *Aphraates, "the Persian Sage."*— Neither the date of his birth nor of his death are known, but he wrote between 336 and 356. He was first a monk, and then bishop of Mar Mathæus, a Persian monastery East of Mosul. His Christology is rather undeveloped, but quite orthodox. He frequently touches on the sacrament of penance and the Blessed Eucharist.— Twenty-three *Demonstrationes,* or homilies, are the most important of his works that have come down to us.

14°. *St. Ephraem Syrus (306-376).*— He was born at Nisibis, and as a young man led the life of a hermit. He was highly esteemed by Bishop Jacob of his native city, whom he is said to have accompanied to the Council of Nicæa. By him he was also made head-master of the school of Nisibis, but when in 363 the city fell into the hands of the Persians, he took up his abode at Edessa. In 370 he traveled to Cap-

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

padocia, in order to make the acquaintance of Basil the Great. The latter ordained him deacon. His own countrymen call him the "Eloquent Mouth," "Prophet of the Syrians," "Doctor of the World," "Pillar of the Church," "Lyre of the Holy Ghost."— Principal works: *Commentaries on Holy Scripture, Homilies, Sacred Hymns or Chants.*

The following is a list of the principal Western theologians during the same period of doctrinal development:

1°. *Hosius of Cordova in Spain (256–357).*— He was ecclesiastical adviser of Constantine, presided at the Synod of Sardica and probably also at the Council of Nicæa, and has been called the "Father of Councils." It seems to have primarily been owing to his exertions that the term *homoousios* was introduced into the Nicene Creed. What Athanasius was to the East that Hosius was to the West, and he has ever been honored as the foremost Western champion of the Catholic faith against Arianism. In his extreme old age he was prevailed upon to sign an Arian symbol of faith, but on his deathbed he declared that he had done so against his will. He labored for the faith almost exclusively by word and deeds; his writings comprise only a few letters.

2°. *St. Hilary of Poitiers (310–366).*— He is commonly called the "Athanasius of the West." In the prime of life, he, together with his wife and daughter, embraced the Catholic faith, and shortly after (355) he was consecrated bishop of Poitiers. Banished through the machinations of the Arian bishop Saturninus of Arles (355), he spent four years in Asia Minor, where he became familiar with the Greek language and Eastern theology. After his return to his diocese, he succeeded in stamping out Arianism in Gaul. He may be considered as the first really great theologian of the Latin Church.— Principal works: *De Trinitate, De Synodis, Commentaries.*

3°. *St. Ambrose of Milan (340–397).*— Whilst still a catechumen, he was by acclamation chosen bishop of Milan, to succeed the Arian Auxentius (374). He was a man of great practical ability, a staunch defender of ecclesiastical traditions, an eloquent preacher, and an able writer, though not a pro-

found theologian. In his many literary productions is noticeable the influence of Eastern writers, whose works he seems to have carefully studied.— Principal works: Besides his many exegetical writings, his *De Fide, De Spiritu Sancto, De Mysteriis, De Poenitentia,* and *De Virginibus,* deserve special mention.

4°. *St. Jerome (331 or 340–420).*— He was born of Catholic parents at Stridon in Dalmatia, but at the age of twenty he went to Rome, where he was shortly after his arrival baptized by Pope Liberius. Somewhat later he journeyed to Treves, to Aquileia, and then to the East, always in search of knowledge. Finally he became a monk, first at Chalcis and then at Bethlehem, where he was ordained priest. He was perhaps the most erudite man of his time: well versed in Latin and Greek classics, thoroughly familiar with the Hebrew language, a renowned exegete, and an able writer. As a theologian, however, he does not rank very high.— Principal works: Translation and recension of Holy Scripture, Commentaries, translations of many Greek theological works, *De Viris Illustribus, Adversus Jovinianum, Contra Vigilantium, Letters and Homilies.*

5°. *St. Augustine of Hippo in Numidia (354–430).*— Among the many great men of the fourth and fifth centuries he was *facile princeps,* and a grateful posterity has honored him with the title "Doctor Gratiæ." As a young man, and whilst still a catechumen, he fell into the heresy of the Manichæans, in which he remained for nine years. Whilst sojourning in Italy, he was converted by the prayers of his pious mother and received baptism from St. Ambrose (387). After his return to Africa he led for three years a monastic life on his little estate near Tagasta. Then, whilst on a visit to Hippo, he was ordained priest, and three years later (394) was consecrated bishop of the same city. During more than forty years he labored unceasingly to promote the interests of the faith, healing the Donatist schism, vigorously opposing the Pelagian, Semi-Pelagian, and Manichæan heresies, instructing the faithful, and training up a body of model priests. So many of his numerous writings are of paramount im-

portance that it is impossible to mention them in this place. Regarding the number of his works, he himself tells us, that, leaving aside his letters and discourses, they are "nonaginta tria in libris ducentis triginta duobus," ninety-three in two hundred and thirty-two books.

6°. Besides these great Western writers, there belong to the same period of a number of minor lights who may be mentioned in passing. Phœbadius of Agen in Aquitaine, who died after 392. He is the reputed author of a treatise *De Fide Orthodoxa contra Arianos*, and also of a *Profession of Faith*.— St. Pacian of Barcelona in Spain. Sometime between 360 and 390 he wrote three letters to the Novatian Sympronianus. The first two treat of the Catholic Church, and the third is devoted to the Catholic teaching on Penance.— Marius Victorinus, a famous rhetorician of Rome during the reign of Constantius. In his old age he was converted to Christianity, and wrote three works against the Arians, *Adversus Arium, De Generatione Divini Verbi,* and *De Homoousio Recipiendo*. From a theological point of view they are of little importance.— Optatus of Mileve in Africa. Between 370 and 385 he wrote a large work in seven books *Contra Parmenianum Donatistam*.— Nicetas of Remesiana in Dacia. He lived towards the end of the fourth century, and wrote a work for the instruction of candidates for Baptism: *Competentibus ad Baptismum Instructionis Libellos Sex*.

CHAPTER XV

THE REACTION AFTER NICÆA: ITS CAUSES: AN OUTLINE OF THE ARIAN CONTROVERSY[1]

"The victory over Arianism achieved at the Council," says Bethune-Baker, "was really a victory snatched by the superior energy and decision of a small minority with the aid of half-hearted allies."[2] This statement is a half-truth, and like most half-truths leads to inferences that are entirely devoid of truth. The condemnation of Arianism, as was shown in the preceding chapter, was practically unanimous and spontaneous. There was no half-heartedness about it on the part of the Council. But the positive formulation of the orthodox faith, conceived in the precise terms that were finally chosen, was in a measure "a victory snatched by the superior energy and decision of a small minority with the aid of half-hearted allies." And this was likely enough to cause some sort of reaction after these "half-hearted allies" found themselves free from the influence of stronger minds and the restraint of imperial authority. How very real this likelihood was, subsequent events soon showed.

A — The Reaction after Nicæa

Hardly had the Council been dissolved when the trouble began. In Egypt the Arians and Meletians caused such a disturbance that a provincial synod had to be summoned; but it led to no results. In Asia Minor Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theogonis of Nicæa openly favored Arianism. They were both sent into banishment, but the ominous mutterings of the

[1] Cfr. Hefele, History of the Councils, II, 1–86, Eng. Transl. 1st Edit. Tixeront, H. D. II, 37–48; [2] Bethune-Baker, An Introduction to the Early History of Christian Doctrine, 171–195; Hergenroether, op. cit. I, 356–384.

storm continued. Some time later they were recalled, through the influence of Constantia sister of Constantine. Then Arius himself, after making a profession of faith that was conceived in the vaguest terms, was allowed to return. Preparations were even made for his readmission into the Church, but his sudden death frustrated the Emperor's designs.

Meanwhile the crafty Eusebius of Nicomedia had wormed himself into the favor of Constantine and was thereby enabled to strengthen his party in its opposition to the Council. He soon had a large following, known to history as the Eusebians. They were all men whose doctrinal views were undefined and whose training had for the most part been along Subordinationist lines. Still afraid to attack the Council openly, he and his party first endeavored to undo the principal champions of orthodoxy. In 330 they succeeded in deposing Eustathius, Patriarch of Antioch, on the charge of Sabellianism. Somewhat later they attacked Marcellus of Ancyra, who had written a book *De Subjectione Domini,* in which Eusebius of Cæsarea claimed to find a defense of Adoptionism. At a synod held in Constantinople they brought about his deposition. The person, however, whom they most desired to ruin was Athanasius, who, on the death of Alexander in 328, had been elected Patriarch of Alexandria. He had been present at the Council as deacon of Alexander, and had greatly distinguished himself in showing up the sophistries of Arius. For this he had incurred the undying hatred of the Eusebians. As they could find nothing else against him, they trumped up a political charge and thereby succeeded in having him banished to Treves. Then Constantine died, being baptized on his deathbed by the principal author of all this mischief, Eusebius of Nicomedia. He was succeeded in the East by his son Constantius, a man of no fixed principles, under whom the Eusebians had a free hand.

B — Nature and Causes of the Arian Controversy

In order to understand the religious confusion that ensued shortly after the death of Constantine, as well as to form

a correct judgment of its bearing on orthodox faith, it is very necessary to keep the following facts clearly in mind.

1°. The disturbance did not affect the whole Church, but was practically confined to Christian communities within the boundaries of the Eastern Empire. In the West only a few localities were affected by the dissension, and most of these but for a short time.

2°. The conflict was not between the Church and Arianism in the strict sense of the term. Real Arians, that is, persons who denied the true divinity of Christ, constituted only a small minority and were violently attacked by all other parties.

3°. The point at issue was the Nicene definition of the Son's relation to the Father as expressed by the term *homoousios*. Hence in the minds of the parties opposed to the Council it was not the true divinity of Christ that was on trial. Excepting the small Arian contingent, that was in principle accepted and defended by all.

4°. In fact, however, the controversy was not a *lis de verbis*, a mere quibbling about words; because the terms substituted for *homoousios*, such as *homoiousios*, and *homoios*, were intended to express a certain subordination and inferiority of the Son to the Father, which must logically and objectively lead to a denial of His divinity, whatever was the view and intention of those by whom they were used. For if the Son is not equal to the Father in His Godhead, He is simply not God; although He be said to be of a like substance, or simply like the Father. God's substance or essence is absolutely simple and indivisible, and as such admits of no multiplication in individuals of the same species.

5°. At the same time, it must not be overlooked that this leaning towards Subordinationism, on the part of the adversaries of the Council, was very much accentuated owing to an imperfect and undeveloped terminology. The terms signifying substance, essence, person, were used indiscriminately now in the one sense and then in the other. Hence when the *homoousians* said that the Son was of the same *ousia* as the Father, meaning thereby that He was of the same essence or substance, the *homoiousians* or *homoians* would in many

instances take this to signify that He was the same person as the Father. For the Arianizing or Eusebian party could never boast of many trained theologians; it consisted mainly of men whose ideas were vague and whose talk was proportionately loud. What they dreaded most was the bugbear of Sabellianism, which had deprived the Word of His distinct personality: this must be beaten down at all costs.

6°. The dissension was mostly in the ranks of bishops and priests; it affected the laity very little. The dissenting clerics had, of course, a certain following among the common people, but that was owing to personal rather than to doctrinal reasons. Still it is not true, as seems to have been the personal view of Cardinal Newman,[2] that the episcopate went astray whilst the laity remained faithful. That view is altogether inaccurate. The episcopate did not go astray, although many bishops did. It must be remembered that very many of the Arianizing bishops had been raised to the episcopate for the purpose of strengthening the party. They were not bishops who seceded from the Catholic Church. Her bishops, as a body, ever remained faithful to her traditional teaching and to the Nicene Creed.

7°. The bishops and priests of the Arianizing party were, as a whole, an heterogeneous collection; gathered together in haste to meet the demands of the moment. Really learned men among them were few, and few also were the men distinguished for their Christian virtue. They were mostly court-prelates, who sought their own interests rather than that of the faith. There were, of course, exceptions, but exceptions can only confirm the rule. Eusebius of Cæsarea in Palestine was a man of wide reading, even of vast erudition, but every student of history knows that he was but a shallow theologian and forever courting the favor of the Emperor. Meletius of Lycopolis, and afterwards of Antioch, was a holy man, but although he caused endless trouble during this controversy, he was at heart always a staunch Catholic.

8°. Much of the bitterness of the controversy was owing

[2] Cfr. The Arians of the Fourth Century, c. 5, s. 1. Further discussion in Appendix, note 5.

to the personal element injected into it by the enemies of Athanasius. The friends of Arius could never forgive him the part he had played at Nicæa. Plots and counterplots were devised to disgrace him with the Emperor, and the Eusebians succeeded in having him banished five times before the controversy was ended.

9°. The temporary success of the Arianizing party was almost entirely due to the favor they enjoyed at court. Backed up by Constantius and Valens they swept everything before them; left to themselves by Julian the Apostate and Jovian the Catholic they sank into insignificance. Their strength was wholly adventitious and in no sense inherent in their cause.

10°. Lastly, therefore, the whole trouble may be laid at the door of Erastianism, although Thomas Erastus was still hidden in the womb of the future. Had the Emperors, Constantine included, confined their attention to the civil interests of the State, future history would have had little to tell about the Arian controversy. A certain reaction there would have been after the Council of Nicæa, supposing that the Council had been summoned at all, but a few years of patient endeavor on the part of the Church would have won back the dissenting party to the unity of the faith. This she effected in the case of Montanism, Novatianism, and other Isms, before Arianism ever saw the light of day.

C — An Outline of the Arian Controversy

With the foregoing facts clearly fixed in mind, it may be possible to form a more or less intelligent view of the confusion and strife that filled the years intervening between the death of Constantine, in 337, and the convening of the second General Council at Constantinople, in 381. Only the merest outline can here be given, and even this must be limited to matters that have in some way a bearing on dogma. For a full account some reliable Church History must be consulted.

The most striking feature of the controversy was the seemingly insatiable desire manifested by the Arianizing party for new symbols of faith. Of these at least a dozen different

forms were drawn up and proposed for universal acceptance, nearly all of them being devised for the twofold purpose of safeguarding the divinity of Christ and of eliminating the obnoxious terms *homoousios* and of the essence of the Father. Excepting the "Blasphemy of Sirmium," so called because in it Christ is denied to be true God, none of them was openly heretical so far as positive doctrine came in question; but they were all so vague in concept and terminology that they admitted of almost any interpretation a person might feel inclined to put upon them, and for this very reason they were under the circumstances unacceptable to all parties.

During the first few years of the conflict Rome adopted a waiting policy, persuaded that a hasty intervention would be likely to intensify the dissension. But in October, 341, Pope Julius called a council at Rome, hoping to bring about an understanding between the dissenting parties. It was a comparative failure from the very beginning. Most of the Eastern bishops pleaded that under the circumstances they could not come, and of the Western only some fifty attended. However the meeting proceeded to investigate the case of Athanasius and Marcellus, both of whom had been deposed by Eastern synods. They were found to be innocent of the charges preferred against them, and their claims to be reinstated in their respective sees were recognized. Then the Pope sent a severe reprimand to the Eusebians for having dared to depose the Patriarch of Alexandria without first notifying Rome, "as had been the custom."

The Eastern bishops received this rebuke in silence, but they gave no evidence that they were influenced by it in their actions. It was about this time that the Dedication Council was held at Antioch, where some ninety bishops had gathered for the purpose of dedicating the great basilica, called the Golden Church, begun by Constantine and completed by Constantius. These bishops were nearly all orthodox, and they issued twenty-five disciplinary canons, which were afterwards received by the Church. The first of these emphasizes the necessity of observing the decree of "the holy and great Council of Nicæa." Three symbols of the faith were also presented, all

of which set aside the *homoousios* and condemned Arianism strictly so called. It was on this occasion that the watchwords of Semi-Arianism, *homoiousios* and *homoios,* were officially introduced.

The following year another attempt was made by the Pope to settle the dispute, and this time the dissenters agreed to appear at a council where all parties should be represented. This initial success was largely owing to Constans, the Catholic Emperor of the West, who prevailed on his brother Constantius to facilitate the convening of the Council. Hence in the autumn of 342 or 343, about eighty bishops, headed by Hosius of Cordova and the two Roman priests Archidamus and Philoxenus, gathered at Sardica, the present Sofia. About half of them came from Greek and Latin Illyricum, whilst the others were from different parts of the West properly so called. Nearly an equal number came from the East, led by the Eusebians Basil of Ancyra, Acacius of Cæsarea, and Maris of Chalcedon. But when they saw that Athanasius, Marcellus, and Asclepas, all deposed by Eastern synods, were treated by the Western party as lawful incumbents of the sees from which they had been driven by violence, they refused to take part in the deliberation of the Council. Their protests, however, were not heeded by the Western bishops, and so they withdrew to Philopopolis in Thrace, where they held a council of their own. They drew up a new symbol, in which they condemned the Sabellians and all those who taught that the Father did not beget the Son by His will. This condemnation was aimed at Marcellus of Ancyra and Photinus of Sirmium, who were accused by the Eusebians of denying the personal distinction of the Son from the Father. Photinus was afterwards deposed by the Catholic party, as he was evidently heterodox in his views.

Meanwhile the Council of Sardica held its session. It restored Athanasius and Marcellus to their sees, deposed the leaders of the Eusebians, and drew up twenty canons. A new symbol seems also to have been composed, but it was never promulgated. The most important of the canons are those relating to the condemnation and deposition of bishops. Such

measures, it is enacted, cannot be taken except by the assembled bishops of the province to which the accused person belongs. Then, if he is not satisfied with the decision thus given, his judges must send the case to the Pope, who shall decide whether there is need of revision. Finally, if the Pope decides there is such need, he himself shall appoint the judges of appeal. This legislation was evidently intended to prevent the recurrence of what had happened in the case of Athanasius and Marcellus. Later on the canons in question were sometimes quoted as Nicene, either through mistake, or more probably because the Council of Sardica came soon to be looked upon as an appendix of Nicæa.

After the Council of Sardica was dissolved, the controversy went on as before. Bishops met in synod, abused their opponents, drew up new symbols to win them over to their side, and then continued the controversy. In 345 the Eusebians held a synod at Antioch and drew up the symbol known as the Macrostich, because of its interminable prolixity. In it they declared the Son to be of the hypostasis, or substance, of the Father; perfect and true God by nature, united to the Father without an interval of separation, and possessing with Him only one dignity; yet also subordinate to the Father, being begotten by Him spontaneously and voluntarily.

Matters grew considerably worse when, on the death of Constans in 350, the Arianizing Constantius became sole Emperor. Then the Antinicæans made a supreme effort to bring all the world to their way of thinking. Synods were held successively at Sirmium, Arles, Milan, Beziers, Rimini, and Seleucia, at all of which their party triumphed, though by physical coercion of the opposing bishops rather than by force of argument. At the two last named synods, that of Rimini and Seleucia, nearly all Catholic and moderate Semi-Arian bishops present were induced by fraud and force to sign a noncommittal symbol, and this was flaunted in the eyes of the world as an Arian victory. It was in reference to this that St. Jerome wrote the words so often misapplied and misinterpreted by later historians: "Ingemuit totus orbis et se esse Arianum miratus est." The world had indeed reason

to marvel, for it was no more Arian than it had ever been, all forced signatures of bishops to the contrary notwithstanding.

Whilst the Arianizing party was thus apparently making rapid progress, it at the same time began to disintegrate. About two years before the synods of Rimini and Seleucia, in 357, during a visit of Constantius to Sirmium, Ursacius of Singidunum, Valens of Mursa, Germinicius of Sirmium, and Potamius of Lisbon, drew up a symbol, or rather a theological document, which became known as the "Blasphemy." Both *homoousios* and *homoiousios* were rejected; the Son was declared inferior to the Father in honor, dignity, and majesty, and also subject to Him; thus making Him in fact a creature. This occasioned a threefold division in the party, thereby creating an extreme left, an extreme right, and a center, as distinguished from one another by their theological views.

The extreme left was under the leadership of Aetius of Antioch, Eunomius of Cizicus, and Eudoxius of Constantinople. God, they said, is essentially simple and one; unbegotten and not produced. Hence any being begotten or produced cannot be God; can be neither *homoousios,* nor *homoiousios,* nor *homoios,* but is necessarily *anomoios.* The Son, therefore, since He is produced, is physically *anomoios* or unlike the Father, although He is morally *homoios* or like Him. The Holy Ghost, like all other created beings, is a creature of the Son. The followers of this party are known in history as the Anomœans, or New Arians, who revived the Arianism of earlier days which had fallen into general disrepute.

The extreme right was led by Basil of Ancyra, who had been intruded into the see of Marcellus. It was made up of Semi-Arians and a certain number of orthodox bishops who somehow distrusted Athanasius and his formulas. Their watchword was *homoiousios,* as they held the Son to be like the Father in substance. Some of the party denied the divinity of the Holy Ghost, whilst others were more or less noncommittal on that point. Strictly speaking it was this denial of the Godhead of the Holy Spirit that earned for them the name of Semi-Arians; for they all admitted the true divinity of

the Son, although they were opposed to the definition of Nicæa.

The center, with leanings to both extremes, was captained by Acacius of Cæsarea in Palestine, who had succeeded the erudite Eusebius. It was largely an heterogeneous collection of makeshift bishops, who were actuated in their contention as much by political as by theological motives. Their motto was *homoios*. The Son, they maintained, was simply like the Father, according to Scripture, without any reference to substance or essence. In history they go under the name of Homœans or Acacians.

It was about this time, 357 or 358, that the reputed falls of Hosius of Cordova and Pope Liberius occurred. Hosius, who was then almost a hundred years old, was after protracted ill treatment and torture prevailed upon to sign the "Blasphemy of Sirium," although he could not be induced to turn against Athanasius. On his deathbed he protested that he signed against his will, and he died in full communion with the Church.

Liberius became Pope in 352. He was a very saintly man, and bore persecution with unflinching courage. Since 355 he had been living in exile at Beræa, and had been supplanted at Rome by the anti-Pope Feliz II. Wearied almost to death by the unceasing argumentations of his keeper, Bishop Demophilus, he was brought to Sirmium, where he is said to have signed a document which stated that he severed all connection with Athanasius, and to have accepted a formula of faith which omitted the *homoousios*. The formula was not heretical but vague. The historian Sozomen states that Liberius at the time openly declared that he considered as strangers to the Church all those who denied that "the Son is like the Father in substance — nay, in everything." Whatever be the truth about his supposed weakness, the fact remains that on his return to Rome he was never reproached with it, though the Romans stood solidly for the faith of Nicæa, and after his death he was universally venerated as a saint.

Finally the real cause of all this trouble, the dogmatizing Emperor Constantius, was called to his account on November

3, 361. With his death the Antinicene agitation lost its force. It had been thrust upon the world by a comparatively small number of court-prelates, whose persistent efforts were made effective by the militant support of their imperial patron. Under Julian the Apostate (361-363) and his Catholic successor Jovian (363-364), a reaction towards orthodoxy set in, which, though somewhat checked during the reign of the Arian Valens (364-367), finally triumphed under Theodosius, through whose efforts the Second General Council was convened at Constantinople in 381. The pacification had, however, already been going on with excellent results for several years past.

CHAPTER XVI

THE MACEDONIAN AND APOLLINARIAN HERESIES: THE SECOND GENERAL COUNCIL[1]

Theodosius was baptized soon after his accession to the throne, in 379, and immediately set about the work of procuring religious unity in his dominions. The pacification of the contending parties had been proceeding satisfactorily for some years past, owing largely to the prudent moderation of the Catholic bishops who exerted themselves everywhere to lead the dissenters back to the fold. Pope Damasus, Hilary of Poitiers, Eusebius of Vercelli, Athanasius of Alexandria, Basil of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, Gregory of Nazianzus, Gregory of Nyssa, and Amphilochius of Iconium, were all staunch defenders of the Nicene Creed, but at the same time they had the good sense to make the conditions of reconciliation as easy as was consistent with orthodox belief. Those who were willing to accept the Symbol of Nicæa, condemn Arianism, and acknowledge the divinity of the Holy Ghost, were admitted to communion if otherwise well disposed. A series of synods, held in different countries, gave permanent and universal effect to the work of these individual bishops. As a result, the disaffected communities in Gaul and Italy, practically the whole of Asia Minor, Egypt, and Syria, were gradually won over to the orthodox faith. Only Constantinople and some of the neighboring provinces still clung to their heretical tenets.

Excellent though these results were, they did not quite satisfy Theodosius. The work, he thought, proceeded too slowly. Like most fervent neophytes, he had more zeal than discretion; and hence on February 27, 380, he issued an edict that

[1] Cfr. Hefele, History of the Councils, II, 340–374, Eng. Transl. 1st Edit. Tixeront, H. D. II, 59-66; Ibid. 94–111; Voisin, L'Apollinarisme; * Bethune-Baker, An Introduction to the Early History of Christian Doctrine, 239–254; Hergenroether, op. cit. I, 384–391.

all must profess the religion which "the Apostle Peter taught the Romans in the days of old, and which is now followed by Pope Damasus, and also by Peter of Alexandria, a man of Apostolic sanctity." However, he soon found that his peremptory edict counted for little with those who were not already disposed to return to the unity of faith. Moreover his reference to Pope Damasus and Peter of Alexandria was a decided *faux pas,* as neither of them was liked by the Orientals. His next step, therefore, was to gather together in a great council the episcopate of the Eastern Empire, prudently refraining from inviting the bishops of the West.

The way for holding the Council at Constantinople had been prepared by Gregory of Nazianzus, nominally bishop of Sasima, who had for some time past been preaching his famous sermons on the Trinity in the chapel of the Anastasis. Whether or not all the Eastern bishops received an invitation is a matter of conjecture, but only 186 appeared at the Council. Meletius of Antioch was appointed president, but he died before the work had well begun. He was succeeded by Gregory of Nazianzus, who had meanwhile been chosen bishop of Constantinople. Gregory, however, always of a vacillating disposition, soon resigned both the presidency of the Council and his episcopal see, and was in his turn succeeded by Nectarius, an imperial official and still a catechumen, who was in quick succession baptized, ordained priest, and consecrated bishop for the vacant see. Under his presidency, which however seems to have been merely an honorary one, the Council concluded its work.

This work was primarily concerned with the suppression of Arianism, but not exclusively so; for whilst the Arian controversy was going on two other heresies sprang up, one of which denied the divinity of the Holy Ghost and the other asserted that Christ as man had only a sensitive soul. During the confusion of the preceding years these vagaries had been more or less overlooked, although Athanasius and others had written against them, but now they called for an authoritative condemnation on the part of the council.

The first of these heresies was necessarily included in strict

Arianism, but shortly after the middle of the fourth century it began to be broached by the Semi-Arians as well. Athanasius refuted it thoroughly in three letters addressed to Serapion, bishop of Thmuis, in whose diocese it was then making considerable stir. About the same time it was propagated in Asia Minor by Marathonius of Nicomedia, and thence found its way to Constantinople and the neighboring provinces. Historically this heresy is commonly called Macedonianism, after Macedonius, who was then bishop of Constantinople, although he does not seem to have had any connection with it. Its defenders were termed Pneumatomachoi, because they were fighting against the Holy Spirit.

Gregory of Nazianzus, in one of his sermons preached about 380, refers to it as follows: "Some have held the Holy Spirit to be an energy, others a creature, others God. Others again have not decided which of these He is, out of reverence, as they say, for the Scriptures, because they lay down nothing precise upon the point. On this account they neither concede to Him divine veneration, nor do they refuse Him honor; thus keeping in their disposition concerning Him to some sort of middle way, which, however, is in effect a very wretched way. Of those, on the other hand, who have held Him to be God, some keep this as a pious opinion to themselves, whilst others have the courage to express their belief openly. Others I have heard in some kind of way mete out the deity, being more wise in so far as they conceive and acknowledge the three as we do, but at the same time maintain a great distinction between them, to the effect that the one is infinite both in respect of being and of power, the second in respect of power but not of being, the third circumscribed in both of these relations." [2] After this exposition of the various views concerning the Holy Spirit, he proceeds to prove His true divinity as professed by Catholics, drawing his arguments chiefly from Holy Scripture.

The second heresy, referred to above, was started about 360 by Apollinaris the Younger, bishop of Laodicea, a man

[2] Orat. 31, 5.

of high culture and undoubted theological learning. The difficulty that presented itself to him was the unity of person in Christ. If Christ has two perfect natures, the one human and the other divine, as Catholics profess to believe, how is He only one person? A union that is so perfect as to result in unity of person necessarily presupposes that at least one of the component parts is in itself capable of being physically perfected by its union with the other. Now Christ was truly God Incarnate, truly a divine person become man; for else He could not have wrought our redemption, since only a God could save the fallen race. Nor did His divine person admit of being perfected, as God is absolutely perfect and unchangeable; hence His human nature must have been lacking some perfection which was supplied by the Word. What was this perfection?

Following the teaching of Plato, Apollinaris tried to solve the problem by assuming three constitutive elements in man: the body, the soul, and the spirit. The body, of course, is the purely material element; the soul is the principle of life and sensation; the spirit is the rational part of man, the controlling and determining principle of his being. Now Christ's humanity evidently comprised the first two elements, the body and the soul; but the third, the spirit or the rational soul, might, he thought, well be supplied by the Word. And this seemed all the more necessary as otherwise the God-Man would have possessed a finite principle of intellectual and moral action, which, it appeared to him, could not be admitted without impiety; because this finite principle, this spirit or rational soul, would be a source of conflict and a predisposition to sin. Hence whilst Christ was perfect God, He was perfect man only in so far as He had a human body and a sensitive soul.[3] As God He was indeed consubstantial with the Father, but as man He was not consubstantial with us — He lacked the very element that makes man a man, the rational soul.

This is the sum and substance of the teaching of Apollinaris, as gathered from the fragments of his works and from the

[3] Cfr. Greg. Naz. Epp. 101, 102; Athan. Adv. Apoll.; Epiphan. Adv. Haer. 77. Greg. Nys. Antirrhet, adv. Apoll.;

writings of his adversaries. It was obviously destructive of the true humanity of Christ, and as soon as it became known it was vigorously attacked and unhesitatingly condemned by individual bishops and by synods. At first, indeed, many refused to believe that Apollinaris really held these erroneous views, because he was a staunch defender of the Nicene Creed and in every way an excellent man; but when Vitalis, one of his disciples, came to Rome, in 375, to clear himself of the charge of heresy, and then refused to acknowledge that the Son of God assumed in the Incarnation a complete human nature, "corpus, animam, sensum, id est, integrum Adam, et, ut expressius dicam, totum veterem nostrum sine peccato hominem," as Pope Damasus worded it, a definite condemnation was pronounced, and when informed of this Apollinaris broke with the Church.

These three heresies, therefore, Arianism in its various forms, Macedonianism, and Apollinarianism, although all of them had already been condemned, came before the Council that was gathered at Constantinople. Most of the discussions, however, seem to have been occupied with Macedonianism, which was strongly defended by some sixty bishops infected with the heresy. No agreement was reached, and so the council finally proceeded to pronounce condemnation.

All we have left of the work of this Council is gathered up in four canons. The first of these proclaims once more the faith of Nicæa and anathematizes all heresy, mentioning by name the Eunomians, the Arians or Eudoxians, the Semi-Arians or Pneumatomachoi, the Sabellians, Marcellians, Photinians, and Apollinarians. The second forbids prelates to meddle with the affairs of other civil "dioceses" than their own. The third gives to the Bishop of Constantinople the preëminence of honor after the Bishop of Rome, "because Constantinople is a New Rome." The fourth decided the case of Maximus the Cynic, who had been unlawfully consecrated bishop of Constantinople; all his ordinations were declared null and void.[4]

[4] Mansi, 3, 557.

The Council did not draw up a new symbol of the faith. It seems, however, that the assembled bishops adopted, with a few modifications, the baptismal creed of the church of Jerusalem, which Epiphanius had published some years before in his *Ancoratus*. It begins with the Symbol of Nicæa, to the third article of which, "And in the Holy Ghost," are added the following words: "Lord and Giver of life; who proceeds from the Father, is adored and glorified with the Father and the Son, who spoke through the prophets." Thus it served as a definition against the Pneumatomachoi, who denied the divinity of the Holy Spirit. This Creed was recited at the Council of Chalcedon, 451, and a little later was received into the liturgy. It is known as the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed.[5]

As Theodosius vigorously enforced the decisions of the Council, the various forms of heresy practically disappeared from the territory subject to his rule. But meanwhile Arianism had begun to infect the numerous Teuton tribes that were hovering about the Northern boundaries of the Empire, preparing to overrun the whole civilized West. It was not until two and three centuries later that they were won over to orthodox Christianity. However, among them it assumed from the first a political rather than a doctrinal aspect. The Macedonians disappeared with the Arians, but the followers of Apollinaris maintained scattered communities in the Empire till the fifth century, when some of them were won back to the faith whilst the rest joined the Eutychian or Monophysite sects.

Thus from 325 to 381, three dogmas of the faith were thoroughly discussed, solemnly defined, and universally accepted by those who claimed communion with the Church — the true divinity of the Son, the true divinity of the Holy Ghost, and the perfect humanity of Christ. In these dogmas others are implicitly contained and at least indirectly defined, as the oneness of God, the personal distinction of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and the doctrine of one person

[5] Ibid. 3, 565; cfr. Funk, Manual of Church History, I. 143.

and two natures in the God-Man. As was pointed out in the preceding chapters, all these truths were taught by the Church long before the first General Council was convened at Nicæa; hence nothing new was added to the faith, but the same old faith was thus presented in a fuller and clearer light.

In regard to this last point St. Athanasius makes a very pertinent remark, when writing about the Council of Nicæa. "When the Fathers came to the paschal question," he states, "they said, 'It is decreed'; but when they declared the faith, they did not say, 'It is decreed'; they said, 'Thus believeth the Catholic Church,' and immediately they confessed what they believed, thus indicating that they did not set forth a new doctrine, but that which had been received from the Apostles." [6]

[6] Epist. De Syn. 5.

CHAPTER XVII

THE ESSENCE AND ATTRIBUTES OF GOD: THE BLESSED TRINITY

From the middle of the fourth century on, theological literature becomes so voluminous that it is impossible to attempt anything like an analysis of the works of the different authors, as was done in the chapters dealing with Antenicene theology. Hence it seems advisable to take up the various points of doctrine as they are usually treated in modern theological text-books, indicating briefly what was held concerning them in successive centuries until their full development was reached. It will not, however, be possible to observe always the same order of sequence, since development of doctrine depends to a considerable extent on the rise of heresies. Still as far as convenient this general plan will be followed, as it appears best adapted to bring out the connection between the different points that come up for consideration.

A — The Essence and Attributes of God

The Trinitarian discussions of the fourth century necessarily involved many concepts that called for definite doctrinal statements concerning the essence and attributes of the divinity. In fact, it was his false concept of God's essence that led Arius into his Trinitarian errors. He conceived the eternal, simple, immutable God as essentially unbegotten, so that all communication of God's substance by way of generation must imply a contradiction in terms. Thus the very essence of God demands that all His productive actions be *ad extra,* terminating in beings whose essence is only analogous to His own. He can create, but not generate. Towards the end of the Arian controversy this erroneous view was so much accentuated that Catholic writers found it neces-

sary to compose formal treatises by way of refutation. It is chiefly in these that the Catholic doctrine on the subject in question is fully explained.

The Arian leader against whom these treatises were principally directed was Eunomius of Cyzicus in Mysia, more famed for his sophistical dialectics than for his knowledge of theology. He looked upon Christ as a pure creature, who, so far from being identical with God, as Catholics held, or like God, as the Semi-Arians taught, must be considered as altogether unlike God, or *anomoios*. Hence his followers were usually called Anomœans. To this conclusion he reasoned from the fundamental proposition that God is absolutely simple. For even Catholics admitted the simplicity of God, and moreover held that the Father at least was unbegotten. Hence *agennesia,* or being unbegotten, must in some way be a divine attribute. Now in a God who is absolutely simple there can be no distinction between attributes and essence, and therefore *agennesia,* is the very essence of God. Consequently, since the Word is said to be begotten, that can only mean by way of creation: and therefore He is a pure creature.

From this same fundamental proposition of God's absolute simplicity he reasoned to other astounding conclusions. Thus a God who is absolutely simple cannot be a God of mystery; hence there is nothing in God that is not perfectly known and comprehended by the human intellect. "God," he was fond of saying, "knows no more about His own substance than we do; nor is this more known to Him or less to us: but whatever we know about the divine substance, that precisely is known to God. On the other hand, whatever He knows, the same also you will find without any difference in us." [1] Thus God is practically reduced to a mere abstraction, whose inmost nature lies unshrouded before the casual glance of the human mind. Not only shall we see God face to face in the world to come, but we do so already in this world.

Against these and similar vagaries Basil the Great and

[1] Socrates, Hist. Eccle. 47.

Gregory of Nyssa wrote their treatises entitled *Contra Eunomium,* in course of which they also explain somewhat in detail the traditional teaching of the Church on the essence and attributes of God. Their fundamental position is that God's essence is being itself — not being in the abstract, but in its very fullness; nor being in the passive sense, but as the source and fountainhead of all activity. "One sign of true divinity," writes Gregory, "is shown us by the word of Holy Scripture, which Moses learned by revelation when he heard the heavenly voice saying: 'I am who am.' That, therefore, alone, we think, ought to be considered truly divine, whose existence is known to be eternal and infinite; and whatever is perceived in this being is always the same, without increment and without diminution." [2] This idea was more fully developed by Gregory of Nazianzus, in a sermon which he delivered a few years later.

"God," he says, "always was, and is, and will be; or rather He always is. For *was* and *will be* are but portions of our passing time and changing nature; but He always *is,* and by this name He called Himself when He spoke to Moses on the mountain. He comprises in Himself all being, which has neither beginning nor end, and in essence is like a vast and boundless ocean, surpassing all thought of time and nature. The mind alone can in some very slight and very obscure way know Him, not directly from the attributes of His being, but from the things that are outside Him, just as from an image one can derive some little knowledge of the original — a knowledge which escapes one before it is firmly grasped. . . . God therefore is immense, and difficult to contemplate; the fact of His immensity alone is clearly perceived." [3]

Basil puts the matter in practically the same light. "The operations of God are various and many, but His essence is simple." However, "when we say that God's essence is simple, that does not prevent us from ascribing to Him many different attributes, as creative power, goodness, justice, providence, fore-knowledge, all so many qualities which deter-

[2] Cont. Eunom. 8. [3] Orat. 43, 3.

mine in some way the one essence of God."[4] Hence, although we cannot comprehend God's essence in itself, just because it is simple and at the same time the very fullness of being, we know His attributes sufficiently well to render Him reasonable service. For "His majesty is known to us, and His power, and His wisdom, and His goodness, and His providence by which He has care of us, and the justice of His judgments; but not His very essence."[5]

In direct answer to Eunomius, Gregory of Nyssa points out that although the Godhead as such is simple and unbegotten, from this it does not follow that the two properties are altogether identical. Simplicity is one thing and not being begotten is another. The Son is also simple, without parts, without quantity, without composition; yet He is begotten, the Only-Begotten of the Father. He is an individual, a person, who possesses the Godhead, although derived from another. Of course, if one arbitrarily assumes that the essence of God, as a divine person, consists in the fact of not being begotten, it is self-evident that the Son cannot be God; but this is begging the question. Not begotten and begotten, as affirmed of the Father and the Son respectively, are personal distinctions in the Godhead; they do not indicate any difference of essence in the persons of whom they are affirmed.[6]

As regards the relation of the attributes to one another and to the divine essence, these writers hold that some distinction must be admitted between them; yet this distinction is not altogether objective and real: it is founded upon the limitations of the human intellect and the infinite perfection of God. It is κατ' ἐπίνοιαν, a mental distinction, to which there is something corresponding in the object, but not in the same way as it is conceived by the mind.[7] The mind reasons from effect to causes; it infers from God's operations in the visible world that He is all-powerful, wise, beneficent, and just; and these attributes are really in God, but not as forming distinct realities, although they appear so to the contemplating mind.

[4] Ep. 234, 1; 235.
[5] Ibid.
[6] Cont. Eunom. 12.
[7] Greg. Nys. Cont. Eunom. 12; Basil, Cont. Eunom. 7.

The same position as regards God's essence had already been taken by Athanasius before the controversy on this particular point reached an acute stage. Thus he writes in connection with the decision of the Nicene Council: "When we hear the expressions, 'I am who am' and 'In the beginning God made heaven and earth,' and 'Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is one Lord,' and 'Thus saith the Lord,' we understand nothing else than the simple, blessed, incomprehensible substance of Him who is; for although we cannot comprehend what precisely He is, nevertheless when we hear the words, Father, God, Omnipotent, we conceive that the reality thus indicated is the substance of Him who is." [8]

Western writers, not directly connected with this controversy, took practically the same view. Thus Hilary of Poitiers, commenting on the words of Exodus, "I am who am," writes: "I am struck with admiration when I consider the absolute significance of these words in reference to God. They bring out the incomprehensibility of the divine nature, and yet in a way adapted to human understanding. Nothing is more proper to God than being itself, which has neither beginning nor end, but is possessed in permanent enjoyment of incorruptible beatitude." [9]

Similarly St. Ambrose: "God, knowing what was in the mind of Moses when he asked, 'What is Thy name?' did not mention His name in replying to the question, but indicated that for which the name stands, 'I am who am': for nothing is more proper to God than always to be." [10] The same was evidently taught in far away Edessa, for Ephrem writes: "God manifested His name to Moses when He said, 'I am,' because this name signifies His essence." [11]

This matter is treated much more thoroughly by St. Augustine, who, as was his wont in regard to questions that had at any time come up for discussion, considered it in all its different aspects. Here, however, we can do no more than simply indicate his line of thought. Deeply conscious that reason must precede faith, he in various places brings out

[8] Ep. De Syn. 35.
[9] De Trin. 1, 5.
[10] Enar. in 12 Ps. Dav. 43, 19.
[11] Serm. Adv. Haeres. 53.

the different arguments that may be used to prove the existence of a personal God, who demands our worship here on earth and promises us eternal blessedness in heaven. The wonderful order of the world points to a wise Providence that directs every being to its appointed end;[12] the varied activities of existing and ever changing natures demand an eternal source of energy which can be none other than God Himself;[13] the ascending scale of finite perfections necessarily implies the existence of an infinitely perfect God who is the source and crown of them all;[14] the eternal ideas and principles which illumine the human mind are in some way a reflection of God's unchangeable truth.[15] To the intelligence this God is the highest truth, to the heart He is the supreme good. Without Him the intellect can have no certain knowledge, without Him the heart can find no lasting rest.[16]

He, too, looks upon being itself as the essence of God. "Putting aside," he says, "every other denomination by which He might be designated, God answered Moses that He was being itself, so that in comparison with Him other beings are as if they were not. Not compared to Him they are indeed, for they are from Him; but in comparison with Him they are not, because He alone is the one true and unchangeable being." [17]

This essence, however, has its definite attributes; for God is all-powerful, all-wise, immense, eternal, and perfect in every way. But all these attributes, in so far as they are realities, are identical with His essence. Hence he writes: "Whatever is mentioned as being in God, is God Himself. For power is not one thing in God and prudence another; nor fortitude, nor justice, nor chastity. Whichever of these attributes you predicate of God, they are neither understood nor rightly said to be really distinct; for this distinction is a matter of the mind illumined by the light which these qualities shed upon it." [18]

[12] Serm. 141, 2.
[13] Confess. 10, 8–10.
[14] De Trin. 8, 5, 4.
[15] Ibid. 8, 5; De Lib. Arbitr. 7–14.
[16] De Civ. Dei, 8, 10, 2.
[17] Enar. in Ps. 134, 4.
[18] De Trin. 6, 4, 6; 6, 7, 8.

Besides the testimony of Holy Scripture, the created world itself proclaims these attributes of God. For by His eternal and unchangeable will He called all beings into existence; they are all the outpouring of His goodness; they were all made according to a preconceived plan, and He preserves them all.[19]

In this condition the Church's teaching on God and His attributes practically remained until the end of the Patristic age, except that the Pseudo-Areapagite towards the middle of the fifth century added some further details. Besides other works, he wrote a treatise on the *Divine Names,* in which He shows that no name taken from creatures can befittingly be applied to God. The attributes of goodness, mercy, power, wisdom, or any other that we perceive in the world around us, are not formally found in the Divinity. God is above all names and all attributes as we understand them. In this sense He is ἀνώνυμος, without a name.[20] Yet as He is the author of all that is positive and good in nature, He must in a certain sense contain all the perfections of His creatures; they are but the multiplied expressions of His absolute unity, and in so far He is also πολυώνυμος, designated by many names.[21]

Analyzing our knowledge of God, he distinguishes three acts as concurring in its genesis. First we affirm of God all perfections of which He is the origin. Next we perceive that He is above and beyond them all, and thereby we deny Him these same perfections. Yet this denial does not destroy our first affirmation; for it simply comes to this that we recognize God to be above all perfections as they are in creatures, and thereby we conclude that He possesses them all in a more eminent degree. This is true knowledge of God, or true theology.[22]

B — The Blessed Trinity

The teaching of the Church on the Blessed Trinity received

[19] De Gen. ad Lit. 4, 26; 4, 22; Confess. 13, 2–5.
[20] De Div. Nom. I, 1, 5, 6; De Myst. Theol. 5.
[21] De Div. Nom. I, 6; II, 3, 11.
[22] De Myst. Theol. I, 2.

its first real development in the East, for it was chiefly there that the Arian heresy called for a clear exposition of the doctrine. The men principally concerned in it were Anthanasius of Alexandria, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzus, Gregory of Nyssa, Didymus the Blind, and Amphilochius of Iconium. They not only defended the divinity of the Son and the Holy Spirit, but made also some attempt to explain the relation that exists between the three divine persons, and thus brought the mystery itself into the foreground of theological discussion. The West, though represented at the time by a number of eminent men, contributed little to the elucidation of the mystery. Hilary of Poitiers, Phoebadius of Agen, Ambrose of Milan, Zeno of Verona, Nicetas of Remesiana in Dacia, and the learned Jerome, were all staunch defenders of the Trinity, but they rarely stopped to theorize or to offer much by way of explanation. Excepting Marius Victorinus, whose Neoplatonic philosophy makes him a very unsafe guide in matters theological, the theoretical side of the question was not touched in the West until Augustine undertook to perfect what had been so well begun by the fourth-century writers of the East. He brought Trinitarian teaching to a point where it remained till the end of the Patristic age.

The first of the Eastern theologians to write copiously on this subject was St. Athanasius, the "Standard Bearer of Orthodoxy." He, however, confined himself mostly to traditional lines of exposition and defense. His fundamental proposition in reference to the true divinity of the Son comes to this: According to Holy Scripture Christ deifies us; therefore He must be God of His very essence. For were He God by participation only, He could not unite us to the Divinity, He could not redeem us; because He Himself would then need to be united to the Godhead. Therefore Christ is true God.[23]

Now God is certainly a unity, He is one; but in this unity, in this one God, there is a trinity.[24] For first of all, the very

[23] De Syn. 5; cfr. Cont. Arian. 1, 16, 39.

[24] Ibid. 1, 18.

name Father supposes the existence of a Son.[25] But as God is without parts, He is necessarily Father of the Son without partition or passion.[26] Hence the generation of the Son does not mean the act of being made, but signifies participation in the entire substance of the Father.[27] The Son is coeternal with the Father, and shares the undivided plenitude of the divinity.[28] They are two, the Father and the Son, but their nature is one, and this oneness is indivisible and inseparable.[29] The Father wills and loves the Son just as necessarily as He wills and loves Himself, and therefore He begets the Son both necessarily and voluntarily.[30] The Father begot the Son by His will, but by His necessary will.

Then there is the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of God, who shares the same divinity and the same power.[31] He sanctifies and deifies us through His indwelling in our hearts, makes us partakers of the divine nature; therefore He, too, must be God by His very essence.[32] The Holy Spirit is inseparable from the substance of the Father and the Son;[33] hence there is but one divinity, one God in three divine persons. "Thus there is a holy and perfect Trinity, which is acknowledged in the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost; . . . having the same and undivided nature, one energy and one operation. For the Father effects everything through the Word in the Holy Spirit, and in this manner the unity of the Holy Trinity is preserved."[34]

As regards the relation of the three divine persons to one another, this is to be held: "The same relation which we know to exist between the Son and the Father, we also find to exist between the Holy Spirit and the Son. For as the Son says: 'Whatsoever the Father has is mine also,' so do we perceive all this to be in the Spirit through the Son. . . . Hence if the Son, on account of His relation to the Father and because He is the proper offspring of the Father's sub-

[25] De Decret. Nic. 30.
[26] Ibid. 11.
[27] Cont. Arian. 1, 16.
[28] Ibid. 1, 14.
[29] Cont. Arian. 4, 1.
[30] Ibid. 1, 16; 62, 66.
[31] De Incarn. 9; Tom. ad Antioch 5.
[32] Ad Serap. 1, 24.
[33] Tom. ad Antioch. 5.
[34] Ad Serap. 1, 28.

stance, is not a creature but consubstantial with the Father, so neither is the Holy Spirit a creature; to say that He is would indeed be impious, because of His relation to the Son, who imparts Him to all, and whatever He has is the Son's own." [35]

St. Basil, besides emphasizing the traditional teaching of the Church, contributed much towards the clarification of ideas and the development of a fixed terminology. Against the Arians he maintained the unity of God, and against the Sabellians the trinity of persons in the Godhead. He condensed His teaching into the short expression: "Μία οὐσία, τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις," one essence, three persons. "In God," he says, "there is at once a certain ineffable and incomprehensible community and distinction: the distinction of persons does not exclude the unity of nature, nor does the unity of nature destroy the proper and characteristic marks of distinction." [36]

He tried to define still further the term ὑπόστασις, which since 362 had gradually come to be distinguished from οὐσία, to signify person in opposition to nature. In this, however, he was not wholly successful, if judged by modern standards of theological precision. "Οὐσία," he says, "has the same relation to ὑπόστασις as the common has to the particular. Every one of us shares in existence by the common term οὐσία, and by his own properties he is such and such a one. In the same manner, in the matter in question, the term οὐσία is common, . . . while the ὑπόστασις is contemplated in the special property of fatherhood, sonship, or the power to sanctify." [37] "Οὐσία in God is the intimate nature or being, in opposition to His attributes (φύσις), and His personal modes (ὑποστάσεις)." [38] As it stands, this explanation would imply a specific rather than numerical identity of nature in the three divine persons; but this, as is evident from his insistence on the oneness and absolute unity of God, was not intended by the author.

The Holy Ghost, although the third in the order of enumeration, has the same essence as the Father and the Son: He

[35] Ibid. 3, 1.
[36] Ep. 38, 4.
[37] Ep. 236, 6.
[38] Cont. Eunon. 1, 10.

must be conceived with them, and not below them; He must be honored with them, and not as inferior to them; He is *homoousios* with the Father and the Son.[39] He is "from the Father through the Only-Begotten,"[40] and "the Son bears the same relation to the Father as the Holy Ghost bears to the Son."[41] "Yet he comes from God not by generation as the Son, but as the Spirit of His mouth. He is also called the Spirit of Christ, as being in respect of nature made His own."[42]

Gregory of Nazianzus devoted long years to the defense and exposition of orthodox Trinitarian teaching, which he sums up as follows: "I give thee this profession of faith as a lifelong guide and protector: One sole divinity and one power, which exists in three together and includes in itself the three distinct, not differing in substance or nature, neither increased by addition nor lessened by subtraction, in every way equal, absolutely one, even as the single and undivided beauty and grandeur of the firmament, an infinite unity of three infinite persons, each being God as considered apart, God the Father and God the Son and God the Holy Ghost, each being distinct by His personal properties; all three together being God: that on account of identity of nature, this on account of one sovereignty."[43]

The same view is taken by Gregory of Nyssa, except that he calls particular attention to the term "Godhead," which, he says, is significant of operation rather than of nature. In connection with this, he develops some remarkably clear ideas on the activity and immanent relations of the three divine persons. "Every activity," he says, "that proceeds from God in reference to creatures, and is designated according to their various kinds, takes its origin from the Father, proceeds through the Son, and is perfected in the Holy Spirit. Hence we cannot speak of several activities, although we predicate plurality of the persons. The activity of each is not divided or separate; but whatsoever is done, be it in the matter

[39] Cont. Eunom. 5; cfr. 1–3.
[40] De Spir. Sanct. 47.
[41] Ibid. 43.
[42] Ibid. 46.
[43] Orat. 40, 41.

of God's providential love for us or His government and direction of the world, is done by the three, nor are the things done threefold." [44] This might have been written by St. Thomas.

Then in reference to the immanent relation of the three divine persons: "Should anyone object against our teaching that by the denial of any difference in nature we confuse and commingle the *hypostases* we reply that, while firmly adhering to the identity of nature, we do not deny the distinction between the principle and what proceeds from it. We find this distinction between them: We believe that one is the principle and that the other is from the principle, and in what is from the principle we find another distinction. For one is from the first immediately, the other only mediately and through that which is immediately from the first, so that the characteristic note of Only-Begotten belongs undoubtedly to the Son. On the other hand it is certain that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, for while the intermediate position of the Son entitles Him to the distinction of Only-Begotten, His natural relation to the Father does not exclude the Holy Spirit." [45]

The divinity of the Holy Ghost he defended specially against the Macedonians. In the course of his argumentation he says: "We confess that the Holy Spirit is coördinate with the Father and the Son, in the sense that between them there is absolutely no difference as regards all things that can be thought and said in a Godfearing way concerning the divine nature, except that the Holy Spirit is a distinct *hypostasis,* because He is from God and of Christ, in such wise that he does not share with the Father in the property of not proceeding, nor with the Son in the property of being the Only-Begotten." [46]

Didymus the Blind treated this matter at length in his three books *De Trinitate,* and in a separate work, *De Spiritu Sancto.* He gives a clear and solid exposition of orthodox teaching on the points in question. Like St. Basil, he sums

[44] Quod non sunt tres Dii, 4, 125. [46] Adv. Maced. 2.
[45] Ibid.

up his Trinitarian views in the proposition, "Μία οὐσία, τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις," one essence, three persons. The Son is *homoousios* with the Father and the Holy Ghost is *homoousios* with the Father and the Son; distinct from one another as persons, they are identical in the essence of the Godhead. "As it is impossible that the Father should not be truly Father from all eternity, so it is impossible that the Son and the Holy Spirit should not be from all eternity and by nature from His very essence; for as soon as the Father was, if one may so speak, immediately the one was born and the other proceeded." [47] Hence anything like a temporal generation or procession is necessarily excluded.

Again: "The Son is said to receive from the Father, whereby He Himself subsists. For neither is the Son aught else but what is given Him by the Father, nor the Holy Ghost but what is given Him by the Son. These things (de meo accipit, etc.) are said in order that we may believe that the nature of the Holy Spirit is the same as that of the Father and the Son." [48] The Holy Ghost, therefore, proceeds immediately from the Son, but ultimately also from the Father.

Amphilochius of Iconium was intimately associated with the three great Cappadocians in the work of pacification, and wrote an excellent Synodal Letter on the *True Divinity of the Holy Spirit*. In the fragment of it that has been preserved he gives a somewhat detailed exposition of the *modus essendi* as proper to each of the three divine persons. "Father, Son, and Holy Ghost," he states, "signify personal relations, and not the nature of the Godhead. The name God designates the *to esse* of the three, whereas the names Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, signify the *to esse tale* of each." [49] In this he somewhat perfected the teaching of Basil and Gregory of Nyssa, who had used the same expression in reference to the Son and the Holy Spirit, but without applying it to the Father.

The same subject was also touched upon by Epiphanius of Salamis in his *Panarium Adversus Haereses*, although he does little more than state the traditional teaching of the Church.

[47] De Spir. Sanct. 1, 15.
[48] Ibid. 3, 12; 6, 37.
[49] Ad Seleuc. fragm. P. G. 39, 112.

"They (the Antiochians)," he says, "confess that the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are consubstantial, three persons, one nature, one Godhead: and this, indeed, is the true faith, delivered to us by our forefathers — the Apostolic faith, announced by the Prophets and the Evangelists, which those fathers and bishops also professed who were gathered together in the Council of Nicæa, held under the great and most blessed Emperor Constantine." [50]

However he adds also something of his own. Replying to the contention of some Arians that in the Catholic view the Holy Spirit must be considered as the brother of the Son or the nephew of the Father, he says: "The Spirit was always with the Father and the Son; not the brother of the Father, not born of Him, not created, not the brother of the Son, nor the nephew of the Father, but proceeding from the Father and receiving from the Son; not foreign to the Father and the Son, but of the same substance and of the same divinity; from the Father and the Son, with the Father and the Son, subsisting always as the Holy Spirit, the Divine Spirit, the Spirit of glory, the Spirit of Christ, the Spirit of the Father. For it is the Spirit of the Father that 'speaketh in you and my Spirit is in the midst of you.' The third in the order of enumeration, He is equal to the others in divinity; not of a different nature from the Father and the Son, but the bond of the Trinity, the seal of confession." [51]

From the foregoing citations it appears quite evident that all these writers hold the absolute and numerical identity of the divine nature as possessed by the three divine persons; and hence Harnack's contention that the Cappadocians were *homoiousians* rather than *homoousians* is without foundation in fact. They all agreed with the teaching of St. Basil, who stated his views on this point very clearly when he wrote: "In accordance with the true doctrine, we speak of the Son as neither like nor unlike the Father; for each of these terms is equally repugnant. Like and unlike are predicated of beings in reference to their accidental determinations, and from

[50] Adv. Haer. 73, 34. [51] Ibid. 62, 4.

such God is free. We, on the contrary, confessing the identity of the nature, accept the *homoousios* and avoid adding to the Father, who is God in substance, the Son, who is also God in substance; for this is what is meant by the *homoousios*." [52]

Hence when they sometimes, by way of illustration, say that God is one as man or mankind is one, notwithstanding the distinction that exists between individuals, it must be borne in mind that in this connection they take man or mankind in the abstract, and not as existing in the concrete order of things. And in the abstract, as a mere concept, mankind is not only specifically but numerically one. Thus the illustration is philosophically faulty, based as it is upon a confusion of the abstract and the concrete, but the theological doctrine which it is intended to illustrate is perfectly orthodox.

With the Trinitarian teaching of these Eastern theologians, as outlined in the preceding paragraphs, their contemporaries of the West were in perfect accord. It must be noted, however, that they look at the matter from a different view-point. Whilst the Eastern writers usually reason from the distinction of persons in the Godhead to the unity of the divine nature, those of the West almost invariably fix their attention primarily upon the unity of the divine nature and then proceed to establish the distinction of persons. The doctrine in each case is the same, but the method of procedure is different. Harnack indeed contends that the Western theologians, and especially Augustine, differed also in doctrine from their Eastern contemporaries,[53] but as already pointed out above, he simply misinterprets the Trinitarian teaching of the East. The groundlessness of his contention will, moreover, appear with sufficient clearness from the following summary of Western theological thought, as gathered from the works of the principal writers belonging to the period now under consideration.

Hilary of Poitiers, commenting on the baptismal formula, writes: "He commanded to baptize in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, that is, in the

[52] Ep. 8, 3.

[53] Dogmengeschichte, II, 304 sqq.

confession of the Author and of the Only-Begotten and of the Gift. There is one Author of all things. For one is God the Father, from whom are all things; one is the Only-Begotten, our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things; and one is the Holy Spirit, the Gift in all things." [54] What kind of unity he has in mind when he says that God is one, he sets forth more clearly in another place: "God is one, not in person but in nature." "Not one subsisting, but one substance without differentiation." [55] "God the Father and God the Son are absolutely one, not by a union of person, but by the unity of substance." [56] Nor is the Son in any way inferior to the Father: "The plenitude of the divinity is perfect in both. For the Son is not a diminution of the Father, nor is the Son less perfect than the Father." [57] And what is said of the Son in this respect, must also be said of the Holy Spirit; for the "names, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, refer to one and the same nature." [58]

Ambrose of Milan speaks in the same strain: "There is," he says, "a certain indistinct substance of the distinct, incomprehensible, and ineffable Trinity. For we have been taught that there is a distinction between the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, not a confusion of the same; a distinction, not a separation; a distinction, not a plurality." [59] Both the distinction and the unity have their reason in the origin of the second and third persons. "For the Father is not the same as the Son, but between the Father and the Son is the distinction that arises from the generation, so that the Son is God of God." "The plenitude of the divinity is in the Father, and the plenitude of the divinity is in the Son; not a different, but the same divinity." [60] The same is also true of the Holy Spirit; for "He received from the Son *per unitatem substantiæ,* even as the Son received from the Father." [61] And "who would dare to say that the Holy

[54] De Trinit, 2, 1.
[55] De Syn. 69, 64; De Trinit. I, 16.
[56] Ibid. 4, 42, 40.
[57] Ibid. 3, 23.
[58] Ibid. 2, 5.
[59] De Fide, 4, 8, 91.
[60] Ibid. 1, 2, 17.
[61] De Spirit, Sanct. 2, 118.

Spirit is different in nature from the Father and from Christ?" [62]

Phœbadius of Agen proposes the same doctrine in equally clear terms. After maintaining against the Arians that the Son is true God, he goes on to say: "If anyone is scandalized at this, let him understand that the Spirit is also God. As the Son is the second person in the Godhead, so is the Holy Spirit the third person. However all three are one God; the three are one. This we believe and this we hold, because this we have been taught by the Prophets, the Evangelists, and by the Apostles of old." [63]

Zeno of Verona, Nicetas of Remesiana, and Jerome adhered closely to the Trinitarian formula worked out by Tertullian: "Una substantia, tres personæ"; "tres personas unius substantiæ et unius divinitatis confitentes." [64] Adjectively this formula is expressed by *consubstantialis,* which has for its Greek equivalent the term *homoousios,* though the latter is more expressive of the identity of nature. The formula is a summary statement of Western theology in reference to the true divinity of the Son and the Holy Spirit.

This traditional teaching we find reproduced in the works of Augustine, who in 387 had been converted and instructed in the faith by the conservative Ambrose of Milan. However as it appears in his writings, it is considerably developed, and set forth with much attention to details. Profiting by the labors of his predecessors and gifted with singular clearness of vision as well as depth of penetration, Augustine brought the Church's Trinitarian teaching to a point of perfection that precluded further development for centuries to come. Only a mere outline of his teaching can here be given, but it will be sufficient to show the fruitfulness of his labors.

In the first chapter of his book *De Trinitate,* he indicates the aim of his work as follows: "Wherefore, our Lord God helping, we will undertake to render, as far as we are able, that very account which they so importunately demand, namely, that the Trinity is the one and only true God, and also how

[62] Ibid. 1, 6, 80.
[63] Cont. Arian. 22.
[64] De Pudic. 21; Adv. Prax. 19.

the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are rightly said, believed, and understood, to be one and the same substance or essence." [65]

He will, however, attempt nothing novel; but only propose what has been the teaching of the Church at all times. For a little further on he states: "All those Catholic expounders of the divine Scriptures, both Old and New, who have written before me concerning the Trinity, and whom I have been able to read, have purposed to teach, according to the Scriptures, this doctrine, that the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit intimate a divine unity of one and the same substance in an indivisible equality, and that therefore they are not three Gods, but one God: although the Father hath begotten the Son, and so He who is the Father is not the Son; and the Son is begotten by the Father, and so He who is the Son is not the Father; and the Holy Spirit is neither the Father nor the Son, but only the Spirit of the Father and of the Son, Himself also coequal with the Father and the Son, and pertaining to the unity of the Trinity. . . . The Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, as they are indivisible, so they work indivisibly. This is also my faith, since it is the Catholic faith." [66]

As appears quite obvious from these introductory remarks, what stood primarily before the author's mind was the unity of the divine nature rather than the trinity of persons. "The Trinity is the one and only true God": one sole divine nature subsisting in three persons; whereas the Greek formula ran: "Three persons having one and the same divine nature." The two formulas propose the same doctrine, but that of Augustine brings out much more clearly the absolute equality of the persons. The subsisting nature is God, and that nature subsists in the Father and in the Son and in the Holy Ghost. Hence the three persons "intimate a divine unity of one and the same substance in an indivisible equality." And this equality is so absolute, that not only is the Father not greater than the Son, nor the Father and the Son greater than the

[65] Op. cit. 1, 4. [66] Ibid.

Holy Spirit, but neither is any single one of the three less than the whole Trinity.[67] "All that the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit together are, that also is the Father alone, or the Son alone, or the Holy Spirit alone."[68] The reason for this is the indivisible unity of the divine nature. Hence the author lays down the rule that all absolute perfections of the Godhead must be predicated in the singular: "Unus Deus, bonus, omnipotens ipsa Trinitas, et quidquid aliud non invicem relative, sed ad se singuli dicuntur; hoc enim secundum essentiam dicuntur."[69]

Yet this indivisible unity of the divine nature does not interfere with the distinction of persons. "For, indeed, since Father is not Son, and Son is not Father, and the Holy Spirit, who is also called the Gift of God, is neither the Father nor the Son, they are certainly three. And so it is said in the plural, 'I and the Father are one'; for He did not say, 'is one,' as the Sabellians say, but 'are one.' Yet if it be asked what the three are, human speech has not the terms to set forth the true answer. Still we say three 'persons,' not that we wish to say it, but that we may not be altogether silent."[70]

Here, then, is the mystery. We are certain of the fact that there is one divine essence, definite and individual, numerically identical in the three who possess it; moreover it does not form a fourth term added to the three persons,[71] but is objectively and really identical with them, being the very Godhead which is Father and Son and Holy Spirit: how this can be, the human mind is unable to fathom. And there is another mystery about the three in so far as they are persons. In what does their personality consist? All we can say is that they are *relationes subsistentes,* subsisting relations; not identical with the divine substance as such, nor objectively and really distinct from it, nor in any sense mere accidents, but essential to the nature of the Godhead. The Father is a person because of the relation He bears to the Son, the Son is a person because of His relation to the Father, and the Holy Spirit is a person

[67] Ibid. 8, procem.
[68] Ibid. 6, 9.
[69] Ibid. 8, procem.
[70] De Trinit. 5, 10.
[71] Ibid. 5, 9.

because of His relation to the Father and the Son. It is the relatio "ad invicem et ad alterutrum" that constitutes them persons.[72] Of course, as already stated, the term person, as applied to the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost, is taken in an analogous sense. Its meaning is not the same as when applied to human beings. The three are called persons, and they are persons; but in it all there is a mystery that lies beyond the reach of human intelligence.[73]

That there can be only three persons in the Godhead, the author tries to make clear in various ways. Thus, for instance, by analyzing the concept of love. "Love is of some one that loves, and with love something is loved. So here are three things: he that loves, and that which is loved, and love. What else then is love but as it were a life that links together or seeks to link together some two things; namely, him that loves and that which is loved?"[74] In the Trinity, then, we have the Father loving the Son, the Son who is loved by the Father, and the Holy Spirit who is love. "One God, and this God Himself the Trinity."

The *relatio originis* is different in the different persons. "The Father alone is of no one else, and for that reason He is called unbegotten, not only in Scripture, but also by those who discuss this profound subject in so far as they are able. The Son is born of the Father; and the Holy Spirit is *principaliter* of the Father, and without the slightest interval of time, proceeds *communiter* from both the Father and the Son. He would indeed be called the son of the Father and the Son, if, what is altogether foreign to those of a sane mind, both had begotten Him. Not therefore begotten by both, but from both of them the Spirit proceeds."[75] Precisely how the procession of the Holy Spirit differs from the generation of the Son, is, the author thinks, a mystery that we shall fathom only in heaven.[76]

The Holy Spirit is said to proceed "principaliter" from the Father. This, however, must not be understood in the

[72] Ibid. 5, 6, 16, 17.
[73] Ibid. 7, 8, 9.
[74] Ibid. 8, 14.
[75] Ibid. 15, 26, 47.
[76] Ibid. 15, 45; cfr. 9, 17, 18.

sense that there are two active principles of procession. "I added *principaliter,* because the Holy Spirit is also found to proceed from the Son. But this also the Father gave Him, not as already existing and not having, but whatever He gave the Word, He gave by begetting Him. For in such wise did He beget Him, that from Him also the Common Gift should proceed and the Holy Spirit should be the Spirit of both."[77] Hence "we cannot say that the Holy Spirit does not also proceed from the Son; for it is not without reason that He is called the Spirit of the Father and of the Son": but "it must be confessed that the Father and the Son are *the principle* of the Holy Spirit, not *two principles.*"[78]

In their operations *ad extra* the three divine persons act as one principle. "When we say that the Father is the *principum creaturæ* and that the Son is the *principium creaturæ,* we do not say two principles; because the Father and the Son are relative to the creature but one principle; there is one Creator as there is one God."[79] "In respect of the creature, the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are one principle, as they are one Creator and one Lord."[80] Moreover, this operation *ad extra* causes no change in the Godhead; for the new denominations which thus arise in time are all based upon a change that is entirely in the creature. God is absolutely unchangeable.[81]

The Trinitarian teaching, thus formulated by these fourth century writers and considerably developed by Augustine, was neatly summarized in the *Symbolum Athanasianum,* which, according to modern research, most probably originated sometime in the fifth century. "Whoso wishes to be saved, it is before all things necessary that he hold the Catholic faith. . . . But the Catholic faith is this: That we venerate one God in the Trinity, and the Trinity in the unity; neither confounding the persons, nor separating the substance. For one is the person of the Father, another that of the Son, another that of the Holy Spirit: but of the Father, and of the Son,

[77] De Trinit. 15, 17, 29.
[78] Ibid. 4, 29; 5, 15.
[79] Ibid. 5, 13, 14.
[80] Ibid. 5, 14, 15.
[81] Ibid. 5, 16, 17.

and of the Holy Spirit, there is one divinity, equal glory, coeternal majesty. What the Father is, that is the Son, that the Holy Spirit. . . . Thus God the Father, God the Son, God the Holy Spirit. And yet not three Gods, but one God. . . . The Father was made of none: not created, not begotten. The Son is of the Father alone: not made, not created, but begotten. The Holy Spirit is of the Father and of the Son: not made, not created, not begotten, but proceeding. . . . And in this Trinity there is nothing prior or posterior, nothing greater or less: but all three persons are coeternal and coequal. So that, as was already said above, both the unity in the Trinity and the Trinity in the unity must be venerated. Whoso therefore wishes to be saved, let him thus think of the Trinity." It may here be added, that the doctrine thus set forth is found expressed in almost the same terms in the *proœmium* to the eighth book of Augustine's *De Trinitate.*

CHAPTER XVIII

MANICHÆISM AND PRISCILLIANISM: THE PROBLEM OF EVIL: THE WORK OF CREATION

Some of the best efforts of the great theologians of the fourth century were spent in refuting the arguments of heretics, who attacked now one and then another of the fundamental doctrines of the Church. This was apparently a regretable necessity, as these efforts might have been spent to great advantage in a peaceful elucidation of the faith. However, as the champions of orthodoxy made the refutation of error, in nearly every instance, an occasion of setting forth the true doctrine, the work thus accomplished was largely of a very positive character, and so contributed at least indirectly to the same end. This is true not only in reference to the Trinitarian and Christological controversies, which involved the greater part of the Christian world, but also in respect of such as were less far-reaching in their influence and effects on the general body of the faithful. To this latter class belong the discussions occasioned by the heresies of Mani and Priscillian, of which the following is a brief account.

A — Manichæism and Priscillianism [1]

Originally Manichæism was not a Christian heresy, but in its westward course, during the fourth and fifth centuries, it adopted many Christian elements, and thereby became a danger to the faith. Its author, whose name is variously given as Mani, Manes, or Manichæus, was a third century Persian dreamer, who represented himself as a divine legate, sent into the world to bring about a religious and moral reformation;

[1] Cfr. Rochat, Essai sur Mani et sa Doctrine: * Bethuen-Baker, op. cit. 93–95; Tixeront, H. D. I, 404–412; Hergenroether, op. cit. I, 297–302; 417–422.

but, although successful in gathering about him many followers, he finally ended on the cross. The fundamental doctrine of his system is that of a dual principle of creation, the one good and the other evil. Between them is the opposition of light and darkness. Only what is good in the world can ultimately be traced to God, whereas what is evil must have its source in an antagonistic power. This power has its concrete existence in Satan and his bad angels, whose one object it is to destroy the work of God. Primitive man, in so far as the spiritual or light-element of his being comes in question, had his existence from the good principle, but in the struggle which ensued between good and evil he fell into the power of Satan. Hence man's life on earth is a perpetual warfare. God through His good angels draws him on to virtuous deeds, whilst Satan through his bad angels drags him into sin. Moreover man carries the elements of this struggle in his own composition. His spirit is of God and inclined to good, but his body is from Satan and essentially evil. Only in so far as the spirit emancipates itself from matter, and as far as possible avoids all contact with matter, does man triumph over the powers of darkness.

In the West the special home of Manichæism was Proconsular Africa, where it gained many followers among the educated classes. However, owing to the opposition of the government, it there developed into a sort of secret society, having its mysterious initiations, its grades, signs, passwords, and occult doctrines, whilst outwardly it assumed a Christian aspect. Its elect were styled bishops, its inferior officers bore the title of priests and deacons, and Christian phraseology was constantly employed to allay suspicion. The strength of its appeal lay chiefly in its apotheosis of human reason, claiming to have an answer to every question and offering to explain the deepest mysteries of the Christian religion. It was this that ensnared Augustine, whilst still an ambitious youth, and held him captive for nine long years. In his work *De Utilitate Credendi,* which was addressed to his friend Honoratus, he says: "Thou knowest, Honoratus, that for this reason alone did we fall into the hands of these men, namely,

that they professed to free us from all error, and bring us to God by pure reason alone, without that terrible principle of authority." [2]

How sadly disappointed he was in what he actually found, he tells us in his Confessions, where he thus pours out his regret and sorrow before God: "I fell, therefore, into the hands of men carnal and loquacious, and full of insane pride, with the snares of Satan on their lips, and a birdlime made up of the syllables of Thy name and that of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Ghost, the Paraclete. These names were ever on their lips, but only on their lips; for their hearts were void of truth. And they incessantly repeated to me, truth, truth, but there was no truth in them. They taught what was false, not only about Thee, my God, who art the very Truth, but even about the elements of this world, Thy creatures." [3]

Thus disillusioned, he took up his pen against the sect, and thoroughly refuted the specious arguments constantly advanced by the leaders to deceive the unwary. In 394 he wrote a book against Adimantus, the first apostle of Manichæism in Africa, and another against *The Fundamental Epistle of Manichæus,* the founder of the sect. Then his old friend Faustus, who was looked up to by the Manichæans as their great champion, published a voluminous work against the Catholic Church and the Old Testament, which Augustine answered, paragraph by paragraph, in thirty-three books. In the course of this refutation he reveals the immoral doctrines and practices of the elect, which were not generally known to the rank and file of the sectaries.

Some years later, in 404, Augustine held a three days' public discussion with Felix, another Manichæan leader, who had come to Hippo for the purpose of re-establishing there a community of his sect. The Acts of this conference were afterwards published in two books, which are usually cited under the title, *Contra Felicem Manichæum.* This was followed by a book against Secundinus, who had urged Augustine to

[2] Util. Cred. I, 1. [3] Confess., III, 6.

return to his former allegiance. His last work against the Manichæans was composed in 420, comprising two books, *Against the Adversaries of the Law and the Prophets.*

Through these patient labors of Augustine many individual heretics were converted to the faith, but the sect as such still continued to flourish, gradually spreading into Gaul and Spain and establishing a community even in Rome. Though subjected to fierce persecution by the Arian Vandals, who about this time invaded Africa, they tenaciously clung to their tenets, and during the sixth and seventh centuries they were still considered sufficiently dangerous to provoke attacks from leading Christian writers. In the Middle Ages Manichæism burst into new life through the efforts of the Cathari, of whom something will be said in the second part of this work.

Closely connected with Manichæism was another error, which, towards the end of the fourth century made its appearance in Spain. This is known to history as Priscillianism. According to the account of Sulpicius Severus,[4] who wrote during the first part of the fifth century, the orginator of this sect was a certain Marcus, from Memphis in Egypt, who towards 370 came to Spain and there gained over to his way of thinking a noble lady, Agape, and the rhetorician Elpidius. These, in their turn, made a disciple of Priscillian, "a man of noble birth, of great riches, bold, restless, eloquent, learned through much reading, and very ready at debate and discussion." [5] He became the leader of the sect, and in a short time gathered about him a large following, gaining over even a number of bishops.

This drew the attention of ecclesiastical superiors to the sect, and after a severe denunciation by Hyginus, bishop of Cordova, Priscillian and his followers were condemned by the Synod of Saragossa, in 380. Unfortunately the suppression of the heresy was entrusted to Ithacius, bishop of Ossanova, whose violence aroused fierce opposition and caused even a number of Catholics to espouse the cause of Priscillian. Among these latter was Hyginus, the first opponent of the

[4] Hist. Sacra, II, 46–51. [5] Ibid. 46.

sect. Priscillian himself was shortly after consecrated bishop of Avila. Then the Emperor Gratian was appealed to by the Catholic party, with the result that the Priscillianists were exiled. However they managed to have the sentence of exile revoked, and when Gratian was a little later assassinated, they resumed their proselytizing with renewed vigor.

Meanwhile they had also found followers in Italy and Aquitaine, and threatened to overrun the whole of Southern Europe. This led Ithacius to seek help from the usurper Maximus, who had established himself at Treves. By his direction a synod was convened at Bordeaux, but Priscillian tried to evade its sentence by appealing to Maximus himself. This, as the event proved, was an unfortunate move. Anxious to please the Catholic party, Maximus was bent on eradicating the heresy at all costs. Although Ithacius withdrew from the prosecution and Martin of Tours vigorously protested against the violent measures that were taken, Priscillian and several of his followers were executed on the charge of having practiced magic, whilst others were sent into exile. It was a disgraceful proceeding and severely condemned by the leading Catholic bishops. Nor did it have the desired effect of rooting out the heresy. The sect continued to flourish till after the Council of Braga, which was held in 563. From that time on it gradually disappeared.[6]

About the teaching of Priscillian there exists at present a considerable diversity of opinion, owing to the recent discovery of some of his writings, which seem to contradict the account given by Sulpicius Severus and other early authorities. As the matter is stilll undecided, it is advisable to give here simply the findings of the Council of Braga, which is in nearly every instance confirmed by writers who were practically contemporaneous with the first rise and spread of Priscillianism. These findings are embodied in seventeen propositions, fifteen of which are exclusively concerned with doctrinal matters. In substance they read as follows:[7]

[6] Cfr. Tixeront, H. D. II, 229–241. A somewhat different account is given by Fr. Lezins, in the Realencyklopaedie fuer Protestantische Theologie und Kirche, 16, 59–65.

[7] Cfr. Mansi, 9, 774 sqq.

1°. Like Sabellius, Priscillian does not admit three distinct persons in the Godhead, but holds that Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are one and the same.

2°. Like the Gnostics, he admits other unintelligible names in the Godhead, saying that the divinity itself is a trinity of the Trinity.

3°. Following Paul of Samosata and Photinus, he says that the Son of God, our Lord, did not exist before He was born of the Virgin.

4°. With Cerdo, Marcion, and Manichæus, he denies that Christ came in a true human nature, and therefore he fasts on the anniversary of Christ's birth and also on Sundays.

5°. With Manichæus he holds that human souls and angels are emanations of the divine substance.

6°. He also maintains that human souls at first dwelt in heaven and there fell into sin, and on account of this they were cast into the bodies of men upon earth.

7°. Adopting the teaching of Manichæus, he contends that the devil was not created by God as a good angel, but of himself came forth from darkness and is in his very being the principle and substance of evil.

8°. He says that some creatures are the work of the devil, who also causes thunder and lightning and storms and droughts.

9°. Like the pagans of old, he teaches that human souls are subject to fate.

10°. He also holds that the twelve signs of the zodiac correspond to the various parts of the human soul and body, and are connected with the names of the Patriarchs.

11°. Like Manichæus he condemns marriage and abhors the procreation of children.

12°. Again like Manichæus he maintains that the formation of the child's body in its mother's womb is the work of the demons, and for that reason he does not believe in the resurrection of the body.

13°. He contends that the body of man is not the work of God, but of the bad angels.

14°. With Manichæus he holds that flesh meat, which God

has given for the use of man, is unclean, and for that reason he abstains from it, and even from vegetables cooked with meat.

15°. He perverts the Scriptures and wrests their teaching to the support of his own errors.

In view of these propositions, which, as already stated, are supported by the testimony of the most ancient writers, Priscillianism may well be regarded as "a mixture of Gnosticism and Manichæism, a composite system in which there are elements of dualism, astrology, Pythagorism, Docetism, and immoderate Encratism — the whole combined with Sabellianism and some Origenistic tenets." [8]

B — The Problem of Evil

Manichæism, and to some extent Priscillianism also, may be regarded as another of the many Oriental attempts to solve the problem of evil in the world. The human mind shrinks from looking upon the good God as the cause of evil, and yet if evil is not caused by God, whence does it come? Its universal and unavoidable presence seems to postulate a universal and self-existing cause, and if this cannot be identified with God, there appears to be no escape from the inference that there is a second principle of creation, whose productive efforts necessarily tend to mar the work of the Creator-God. This idea seems to be at the root of Oriental dualism and most likely inspired the dreams of Mani.

It was largely in reference to this point that Catholic writers discussed the question of creation with the Manichæan sectaries. They emphasized the teaching of faith that God is the sole author of the world and the endless variety of beings it contains, that He created them by His all-powerful will, made them all the beneficiaries of His goodness, and never ceases from directing them wisely to their appointed end. "Believe," says Gregory of Nazianzus, "that the whole world, the visible as well as the invisible, was made by God out of nothing, that it is governed by the Creator's providence,

[8] Cfr. Tixeront, op. cit. 237.

and is destined for a more exalted end." [9] They readily admitted the prevalence of evil in the world, and also that its presence in a world created by the good God enshrouds the problem in a deep mystery; but they were agreed that its solution, in so far as it may be attempted by the human mind, must be sought in an abuse of man's free will, which destroyed his primitive happiness and made him the prey of temptation and sin, of sickness and death.

It was especially St. Augustin who defended this view against the Manichæans, and thus solved the problem of evil in so far as it admits of a human solution. Having himself been a follower of the sect for nine years, he fully understood their position, and also remembered the difficulties which he had encountered during those years of conflict. Hence the memorable words with which he opens his refutation of the Manichæan errors. "May the omnipotent God," he says, "the giver of all good gifts, enable me to refute your errors with a calm and peaceful mind, bent more on your conversion than your ruin. Let those be angry with you who know not what it costs to arrive at the truth. Let those be angry with you who were never held captive in the same errors. For my part, having been long held captive in them; having heard and studied and rashly believed them; having obstinately defended and zealously propagated them; having at last escaped from them only by the merciful intervention of the Sovereign Physician of my soul; never can I bring myself to be angry with you, but, on the contrary, I shall always feel obliged to extend to you that forbearance which my friends extended to me when I wandered blindly and madly in your errors." [10]

Again, in his Confessions he states: "Whence does evil come, I asked, and there was no solution." [11] It was only when he became familiar with the Catholic view that the solution suggested itself to his searching mind. In a few words it comes to this. It is an absurdity to say that evil is a positive being, in itself an existing reality. Evil is a defect, a negation of good. "It is nothing else than a cor-

[9] Orat. 40, 46.
[10] Cont. Ep. Fundam.
[11] Confess. 7, 11.

ruption either of the condition of beings, or of their nature, or of the natural order of things." [12] Hence there can be no evil by nature. "In itself all nature is good, and it is only through a diminution of what is good that it is affected by evil." [13]

This evil may be divided into three different kinds: Metaphysical, Physical, and Moral. The first is evil only in an improper sense of the term, being nothing more than merely natural limitations. Thus every created being is necessarily finite, and the very fact of its being finite denotes the absence of higher perfections than are due to its nature.[14] The second is real evil, but wholly confined to the natural order of things. It consists in the privation of a perfection which is in some way due to the nature of a given individual. Thus by nature man was intended to have the use of his bodily senses; if he is deprived of it, whether congenitally or in later life, he is afflicted by a physical evil.[15] This God in His wise providence sometimes permits, and sometimes positively inflicts as a punishment for sins. The third is an evil in the strictest sense of the term, and consists in the privation of a moral perfection that is due under given conditions. This results only from an abuse of free will by a reasonable creature. When man sins, for instance, he thereby loses God's grace, which is an evil beyond all calculation; but the evil is of his own making and was not intended by God, except as a consequence of sin.[16]

In this exposition, which he amplified on various occasions, St. Augustine clearly formulated the Catholic doctrine on the question of evil, and subsequent writers did little more than apply the principles which he had drawn with unerring logic from reason and faith.

C — The Work of Creation

There are few doctrines that were from the very first set forth more clearly and definitely than that of creation. Even

[12] De Nat. Boni, 4.
[13] Ibid. 17.
[14] De Nat. Boni, 8, 16, 23.
[15] Ibid. 10.
[16] De Duab. Anim. 14; 15.

the Apostolic Fathers, as we have seen, were quite explicit on that point. The Apologists, too, brought it out as occasion required; and so did Irenæus, Tertullian, Cyprian, and the Alexandrians, Clement and Origen. Among the orthodox there never was any dissension about the matter, but pagan philosophers and heretical innovators made it necessary that this fundamental doctrine should be placed in the clearest light. However it was mainly the fact of creation that was emphasized; merely theoretical aspects of the question were usually relegated to the background. All of these writers maintained that the world was created out of nothing, that it was called into existence by the Father, through the Son; and, as some added, in the Holy Spirit.

It was in this condition that the great theologians of the fourth century found the doctrine when they were called upon to defend it against heretics or explain it to the people. They developed it to some extent, but principally in reference to other points of doctrine which then formed the chief subjects of discussion. A few citations will suffice to bring out their views on the matter in question.

Emphasizing the fact that God created the world out of nothing, St. Athanasius writes: "Some, among whom is also enumerated the great Plato, assert that God made everything out of preëxisting matter; for, say they, God could not have made anything if matter had not already existed, similarly as the wood which the carpenter uses must first exist before he can make anything out of it.

"See, then what foolish babble they give out. But the divine teaching and the faith of Christ utterly rejects this nonsense as a detestable impiety. For it knows that things were not made fortuitously, because everything is governed by Providence, nor were things made of preëxisting matter, because God is not wanting in power; He made all things, in nowise as yet existing, out of nothing through the Word, and thus caused them to be, as He said through Moses: 'In the beginning God made heaven and earth.'" [17]

[17] De Incarn. 2.

With this view of creation the other writers are in full agreement. Hence St. Chrysostom states: "To say that the things which are were made out of preëxisting matter, and not to confess that the Maker of all things created them out of nothing, is a sign of extreme foolishness." [18]

God was always Creator, but the created universe began in time. From this universally admitted fact the Arians attempted to refute their Catholic opponents, who inferred from God's eternal Fatherhood that the Son existed from all eternity. This inference, the Arians contended, cannot be valid; for all admit that God was always Creator, and yet there was a time when the world did not exist: hence although He was always Father, it does not follow that He always had a Son. Athanasius replied to this argument by making a distinction between divine generation and the act of creation. "Creatures," he says, "were made out of nothing, they were not before they were made; how then could they eternally coexist with God, who always is? . . . But the Son necessarily always exists, because He is not the work of the Father but is proper to His very nature. For as God is always Father, that also must always be which is proper to His nature, which same is both His Word and His Wisdom." [19]

God created the world freely, but He generated the Son through a necessity of the divine nature. For the nonexistence of creatures does not detract from the perfection of their Maker, as He can produce them at any time according to His good pleasure; but if the Son were not always with the Father, the result would be a diminution of the divine perfection. Hence His created works God produced through the Son when it pleased Him; but His Son always is, because He is the proper offspring of His nature.[20]

This free creation of the world was the outcome of God's goodness, as is thus clearly expressed by St. Hilary. "God created man not because He had need of his services in any way, but because He is good. He called into existence a sharer in His own blessedness, and He endowed the *animal*

[18] In Gen. Hom. 2, 2.
[19] Adv. Arian. 1, 29.
[20] Ibid.

rationale with life and understanding for the purpose of bestowing upon him His own eternity." [21] Hence the ultimate end which God had in view in creating the world was His own glorification through man's eternal happiness, and also through the eternal happiness of the blessed angels." [22]

The creative act whereby the world was called into being must be attributed to the whole Trinity, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, as having but one will and one power. "The Father," says St. Ephrem, "is the Genitor, the Son is begotten in His bosom, and the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son. The Father is the Maker who made the world out of nothing, the Son is the Creator who together with the Father called the universe into being, the Holy Spirit is the Paraclete and the merciful Dispenser, by whom all that was and is and will be is perfected. The Father is the Mind, the Son is the Word, the Holy Spirit is the Voice — three names, but one will and one power." [23]

Moreover this creative act is such that it lies entirely beyond the power of any and every finite being. Hence the very fact that the Son is the creator of the world shows Him to be truly God. This is strongly brought out by Athanasius in his writings against the Arians. "For how is it possible," he asks, "that He should produce the things that are not, if He Himself, as you think, was made out of nothing? For if He, although Himself created, could produce a creature, then certainly the same must also be assumed in regard to other creatures, namely that they also have power to create. And if this is conceded by you, what need was there of the Word, since inferior beings could thus be produced by those of a higher order, or, to say the least, since each single being could in the beginning have heard from God: 'Be thou made,' or, 'Be ye made,' and thus they would have been produced. But this is neither written nor could in any way be. For none of those things that are made can be a creative cause; for all things were made through the Word, and this would certainly not be true if the Word also belonged to the category of cre-

[21] Tract. super. Ps. I, 2, 15.
[22] Greg. Naz. Orat. 38, 9.
[23] De Def. et Trin. 11, 12.

ated beings. And indeed not even the angels can create, seeing that they too have been created, although this is held by Valentinus, Marcion, and Basilides, whose rivals you are." [24]

These few citations are sufficient to indicate what were the general views entertained at the time in regard to the work of creation. The matter was somewhat more fully treated by Augustine, whose teaching on this point may be briefly summarized as follows:

In regard to the various points already touched upon in the preceding paragraphs, he is in full agreement with his contemporaries. "God," he says, "is most properly believed to have made all things out of nothing, for, although the things that were formed (in the second creation) were made of existing matter, nevertheless this matter itself was made absolutely out of nothing." [25] Hence the author distinguishes two moments of creation: the production of matter and spirits out of nothing, and the organization of the material universe. The first he finds recorded in verses one and two of Genesis, and the second in the subsequent verses of the first chapter.[26]

The creative act is common to the three Divine Persons in such a way that there is only one Creator, and it is of such a nature that the creature has nothing in common with the being of the Godhead. "That this Trinity, therefore, is called one God, and that He made and created all things that are, in as much as they are, Catholic teaching bids us to believe; so that all creatures, whether intellectual or corporal, or to put it briefly according to the words of Holy Scripture, whether invisible or visible, are not born of God, but are made by God out of nothing; and that there is nothing in them that is part of the Trinity, only that the Trinity produced them all. Wherefore it is not lawful either to say or to believe that creatures are consubstantial with God or coeternal." [27] And again: "In regard to creatures the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are one principle, as also one Creator and one Lord.[28]

[24] Adv. Arian. 2, 21.
[25] De Gen. Cont. Manich. 1, 6, 10.
[26] Ibid. 1, 7, 11.
[27] De Gen. ad Lit. Imperf. I.
[28] De Trin. 5, 14, 15.

Creation, in the strict sense of the term, presupposes omnipotence in the Creator, so that it lies beyond the reach of any finite power. "To make a thing out of nothing, to cause that to be which in no wise exists, is not within the power of man. Whilst God, because He is omnipotent, begot His Son of Himself, and made the world out of nothing, and formed man from the slime of the earth, so that through this threefold power He made it manifest that His production reaches out to all things." [29] Again: "Angels cannot create any nature; for the only and one Creator of every nature, whether great or small, is God, that is, the Trinity itself, the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit." [30]

Although the world was created in time, nevertheless God did not for that reason undergo any change; for "by one and the same eternal and immutable will He brought it about that the things which He made should first not be, so long as they were not, and afterwards should be, when they began to exist." [31]

God created the world in accordance with a definite plan, and the archetypes of beings to be created were from all eternity in His mind. For to say that anything outside of Himself served Him as a model would be a sacrilege. Hence these archetypes are eternal and unchangeable and true. It was to them that Plato referred when he taught the existence of an ideal world, and it is by participating in them that created beings are.[32]

This, however, did not interfere with His freedom in creating: He made all things, not because He was forced thereto, but because He so willed. The cause of all His works is His free will.[33] And the reason why His free will called creatures into being is His goodness. For the words, God saw that it was good, "make it sufficiently clear that God made the things which He did make, not through any necessity, nor because of any need He had of their usefulness, but solely on account of His goodness, *id est, quia bonum est.*" [34]

[29] Cont. Felic. 2, 18.
[30] De Civit. Dei, 12, 17, 2.
[31] De Trin. 9, 15, 26.
[32] De Div. Quaest, 46, 2.
[33] Enarrat, in Ps. 134, 10.
[34] De Civit. Dei, 11, 24.

The beings thus created by God depend constantly on His sustaining power for their continued existence. Hence when it is said in Holy Scripture that on the seventh day God rested from His work, that is to be understood in reference to creation of new species, and not in regard to the kinds of beings already called into existence; for if He were to withdraw His sustaining power from them, they would instantly fall back into nothingness.[35]

All these points, though brought out more fully by Augustine, were contained in the common teaching at the time. He added, however, some speculations of his own. In the first place, he contended that all things were created together in one instant of time, regarding the six days of Genesis merely as a convenient division adopted by the sacred writer for the purpose of reducing his narrative to a certain order. For "of the same Creator of whom Holy Scripture narrates that He consummated all his works in six days, it elsewhere not inconsistently states that He created all things together. Whence it appears that He made the six or seven days, or rather the one day six or seven times repeated, all at once, because He made all things together." [36]

However this must not be understood in the sense that all things then already obtained their actual and complete being. What God really did create in that first instant of time, in so far as this visible universe comes in question, was matter with all its potencies, predispositions, and tendencies to evolve under given conditions into those species and varieties of beings that were ultimately intended by the Creator. For "there are in corporeal things, embracing all the elements of the world, certain occult seminal causes (seminariæ rationes), by reason of which, when the opportunity offers itself in the lapse of time and the proper causes are at hand, they evolve into the species that are due to their mode of being and to the end intended. And hence the angels, who cause animals to be, are not called their creators, as also farmers are not called the creators of their crops, or of trees, or of whatever else the earth brings forth, although they know how to pro-

[35] De Gen. ad Lit. 4, 12, 22. [36] Ibid. 4, 33, 52.

vide certain visible opportunities and causes for the purpose of bringing these things into being. And what farmers do visibly, that the angels do invisibly; but God alone is the one Creator, who implanted in things the causes themselves and the seminal reasons." [37]

In this sense the human body also was created in that first instant of time, but not the soul. "Let it, therefore, be believed, if not against Scripture or reason, that man was so made on the sixth day, that the causal reason (ratio causalis) of the human body was created among the elements of the world; but the soul itself, created as the first day was created, was reserved among the works of God until it should be breathed in its own time into a body formed of slime." [38]

Augustine's doctrine on the points in question is condensed into this single passage: "In that first framing of the world the future man was made; the reason of the man that was to be created, not the man actually created. But these things take one form in the Word of God, where they are eternal, not made; another in the elements of the world, where all things to be are created together; another in the things which are created in their own time, not all together, but according to the causes created together." [39]

At first sight all this looks very much like the modern theory of evolution, in as much as unformed matter is said to have been endowed with the potency of evolving itself under given conditions into different species of beings. However upon closer examination it is found that this was not in the mind of Augustine. For although the *rationes seminales* were implanted in matter at the beginning of time, nevertheless the actual production of finally complete beings is according to him the work of God, and not of matter alone. Hence he writes: "The earth is then said to produce the herb and the tree causally — that is, it received the power to produce them. For in it were now made, as if in the roots of time, those things which were afterwards to be produced in the course of time. God afterwards planted paradise, and brought forth

[37] In Heptat. 2, 21.
[38] De Gen. ad Lit. 7, 24.
[39] Ibid. 6, 10.

of this earth all manner of trees fair to behold and pleasant to eat of; but we must not suppose that He added any new species (creatura) which He had not previously made, and which was needed to complete that perfection of which it is said that they were good. No, for all the species of plants and trees had been produced in the first creation (conditione), from which God rested, thenceforth moving and administering, as time went on, those same things which He had formed. Not only did He then plant paradise, but even now all things that are produced. For who else creates them now but He who worketh until now? For He creates them now from things that already exist; then, when they had no existence whatever, and when that day (the first) was made." [40]

What precisely Augustine understood by these *rationes* of things, in so far as they are precontained in corporeal elements, is not very clear. He sharply distinguishes two kinds: the *rationes causales* and the *rationes seminales*. Thus he would call the qualities of wood, which enable us to convert it into fire, its causal reasons, and the qualities of seeds, which make them develop into one kind of plant rather than into another, their seminal reasons.[41] Yet it is to be noticed, as modern critics point out, that whenever he uses the form *rationes seminales* in connection with matter as first created, he invariably modifies it by "quasi" or its equivalents.[42] Hence the other expressions, obviously used in the same sense: "modorum rationes," [43] "formabilitas," [44] "potentia." [45] The form most commonly employed in this connection is "rationes causales," to which correspond the adverbial expressions "causaliter" and "potentialiter." Hence that he ascribes some kind of casuality to these rationes is obvious; but of what kind it is he nowhere states.

[40] Ibid. 5, 4.
[41] Cfr. De Gen. ad Lit. 9, 17, 32.
[42] Cfr. Ibid. 4, 51; 6, 8, 11, 18; 9, 32.
[43] Ibid. 9, 32.
[44] Ibid. 5, 16.
[45] Ibid. 5, 44.

CHAPTER XIX

ANGELOLOGY: ANTHROPOLOGY

In the foregoing chapter a brief outline has been given of the doctrine on creation in general, which must now be supplemented by a short account of what was held in regard to God's noblest creatures, the angels and man. In this there is no need of inquiring into the mere fact of their having been created by God; for that was never made a matter of discussion among Catholic writers, nor is it a subject that admits of doctrinal development. It is rather their nature, their primitive condition, and their final destiny that comes up for investigation. No special treatises were written on these subjects in Patristic times; still in their sermons to the people, and especially in their homilies on passages of Holy Scripture, the various writers found occasion to set forth the common teaching, and incidentally also to develop their own ideas. As we shall see, concepts on several of these matters were still somewhat vague, so that there was considerable room for doctrinal development.

A — Angelology

Regarding the angels, which were from the very beginning of Christianity looked upon as the first creatures of God, early orthodox teaching was little more than a reproduction of Scriptural data. Nor did the fourth-century writers go much beyond this. They had no occasion to defend the Church's doctrine on this subject against adversaries, and so they expressed their views concerning it only in a casual way, and usually in connection with other matters. Still they touched on nearly every point of the doctrine, and incidentally also contributed something to its gradual development. Hence a few remarks on their teaching will be in place here, to which

may be added a summary statement of what was accomplished by subsequent writers.

A fair outline of the doctrine, as it was commonly understood during the fourth century, is thus given by Gregory of Nazianzus: "Angels are called spirits and fire: spirits because they are endowed with an intellectual nature; fire, because they take part in the purification of our souls. Sometimes also these names are primarily used to signify the angelic essence. In respect to us they are indeed incorporeal, or at least very nearly approaching thereto. You see, then, how hard we try to throw some light on this matter, and yet we are not able to proceed very far; or certainly we cannot go beyond the statement that some of them are Angels, others Archangels, others Thrones, Powers, Principalities, Dominations, Splendors, Sublimities, Intellectual Powers, or rather Minds, pure natures, in no wise adulterated, immovable in respect of evil, or certainly not easily moved thereto, forever gathered in jubilant ranks around the First Cause; . . . chanting the praises of the Divine Majesty, and unceasingly beholding that everlasting glory, not that thereby the glory of God receives an increase (for there is nothing that can be added to the glory of Him who possesses all and is the author of all honors that accrue to others), but rather that these natures, first after God, may not cease to be filled with blessings." [1]

As is sufficiently evident from this passage, the details of the doctrine were at the time not well determined. The author does not know whether the angels are pure spirits, although he is inclined to think that they are. St. Basil, on the other hand, seems quite certain that they are not; for he writes: "The substance of these heavenly powers is a breath of air, or an immaterial fire, according to what is written: 'He makes His angels spirits, and His ministers a flame of fire'; and therefore they are in circumscribed places, and become visible, appearing in their own bodies to those who are worthy." [2] Gregory of Nyssa states that "rational creatures

[1] Orat. 28, 31. [2] De Spir. Sanct. 38.

are divided into incorporeal and corporeal nature. The angelic nature is incorporeal, our human nature is corporeal. The angelic nature, therefore, is intellectual, and free from a body that weighs it down (from a body, I say, that is rebellious and ever inclining earthward); destined for the higher regions, this nature dwells in lightsome and ethereal places."[3] He too, appears to have some doubt concerning their absolute spirituality, although he is usually cited as defending it without reserve.

The same uncertainty with regard to this point is found among the Latin writers of this period. Some of them, like Hilary and Ambrose, were inclined to believe that the angels fell through unchastity, sinning, that is, with the "daughters of men," and that consequently they had a body. Jerome rejects this interpretation of the text in Genesis altogether, but at the same time confesses that about the nature of the angelic substance nothing is known.[4] Augustine, though not pronouncing definitely on the merits of the case, for his own part prefers to believe that angels have some sort of body; this being more in accord with the texts of Scripture which speak about angels appearing to men.[5] This also helps us to explain how material fire can torture "the devil and his angels" in hell.[6]

It was not until the end of the fifth century that belief in the absolute spirituality of the angelic nature became general. This was primarily owing to the authority of the Pseudo-Areopagite. Although he was some unknown fifth century writer, apparently of Monophysite leanings, he purported to be the Dionysius of Athens mentioned by St. Luke in the Acts of the Apostles.[7] Hence as soon as his writings became known they obtained great vogue, although when cited for the first time at a synod, they were immediately rejected by the Catholic party as spurious. He represents the angels as having an altogether spiritual nature, a simple essence which somewhat resembles the simple essence of God. They are

[3] De Orat. Dom. 4.
[4] In Ezech. 27, 16.
[5] Ep. 95, 8; De Civ. Dei, 21, 10.
[6] Ibid. 21, 10, 1.
[7] Acts, 17, 34.

entirely intellectual beings, supramundane spirits, who have no body of any kind.[8] At the time when he wrote it was indeed already quite common to speak of the angels as ἀσώματοι, without a body; but this expression, as then used, was rather indefinite, frequently excluding only a gross body like ours. Hence little can be inferred from it in regard to the absolute spirituality of the angels. His writings, however, are quite clear and definite on the point: angels are pure spirits. Abbot Maximus incorporated this view in his *Scholia,* and from that time forward it became quite general.

To the same Eastern source must also be traced our present division of the angelic host into orders and choirs. Gregory of Nazianzus, as seen above, was still very indefinite on this point; and so were his contemporaries, usually employing the designations found in the Epistles of St. Paul. Dionysius, however, introduced a definite classification of the heavenly spirits, building up a celestial hierarchy of three orders and nine choirs, which in their appointed ranks and degrees act as intermediaries between God and man.[9] After him Gregory the Great adopted practically the same classification, founding it upon the teaching of Holy Scripture. "We know," he says, "on the authority of Scripture that there are nine choirs of angels, namely, Angels, Archangels, Virtues, Powers, Principalities, Dominations, Thrones, Cherubim, and Seraphim. That there are Angels and Archangels nearly every page of the Bible tells us, and the books of the Prophets speak of Cherubim and Seraphim. St. Paul, too, writing to the Ephesians, enumerates four orders when he says: 'Above all Principality, and Power, and Virtue, and Domination'; and again, writing to the Colossians he says: 'Whether Thrones, or Dominations, or Principalities, or Powers.' If we now join these lists together, we have five choirs, and adding Angels and Archangels, Cherubim and Seraphim, we find nine choirs of angels." [10]

On some other points, however, the fourth-century writers are as definite as their successors in subsequent ages. They

[8] De Coel. Hierarch. 4, 1, 2; 15, 1.
[9] Ibid. 4, 3; 6, 2; 8, 2.
[10] In Evang. Hom. 2, 34, 7.

are all agreed that the angels were created by God for the same purpose as man, to render their Maker faithful service and to receive from Him the reward of eternal blessedness in heaven. All are agreed, too, that the angels were created before man, but there is no agreement as regards the particular time of their creation. Thus Ambrose holds that the creation of the angels preceded that of the visible world: "Although they at some time began to be, nevertheless they were already in existence when this world was made." [11] Epiphanius, on the other hand, is quite certain that the angels were created after "heaven and earth." "This," he writes, "the word of God evidently declares, that the angels were neither produced after the stars, nor before heaven and earth were constituted." [12] Augustine is undecided, holding however as most probable that their creation is recorded either in the first or the third verse of Genesis.[13]

There is among them a more perfect agreement in reference to the elevation and fall of the angels. Thus St. Basil writes: "For neither are the Powers of the heavens holy by their own nature; if they were, they would not differ from the Holy Spirit: but in proportion as they rise one above the other in perfection do they receive from the Spirit the proper measure of sanctification. . . . But sanctification, which is distinct from their substance, perfects them through the communication of the Spirit." [14] And again: "No sanctity is ever acquired except through the presence of the Holy Spirit. Therefore their angelic nature they have from the Creative Word, the Maker of all things; but their sanctity was imparted to them by the Holy Ghost. For the angels were not created as little children, perfecting themselves by personal endeavor and thus rendering themselves worthy to receive the Spirit; but they received their sanctity together with their substance at the moment of creation." [15] Augustine speaks in almost identical terms. Arguing that every good and meritorious action, even as proceeding from the free will of creatures, must

[11] Hexaem. 1, 5, 19.
[12] Adv. Haer. 65, 5.
[13] De Gen. ad Lit. 1, 7, 15.
[14] De Spir. Sanct. 16, 38.
[15] In Ps. Hom. 32, 4.

be traced back to the grace of God as its ultimate cause, he says: "And this good will (of the angels) who had given it, if not He who imparted it to them in their creation? That is, He gave them that chaste love through which they cling to Him, at one and the same time constituting their nature and bestowing His grace." [16]

As created by God, the angels were all good; but some fell away from their Maker and were turned into devils. The majority of these writers attribute the fall of the angels to pride. Thus Athanasius, whilst recommending the practice of humility, argues: "It was not on account of impurity, or adultery, or theft, that Satan was cast out of heaven; but it was his pride that hurled him thence into the lower abyss. For thus he spoke: 'I will ascend and place my throne over against that of God, I will be like unto the Most High!' And because of this boast was he cast out, and the eternal fire became his portion." [17] Similarly St. Augustine: "Some," he writes, "contend that Satan fell because he envied man on account of his having been made to the likeness of God. But however that be, it is certain that envy follows pride, and does not precede it; for envy is not the cause of pride, but pride is the cause of envy." [18]

By nature the angels were endowed with singular powers and knowledge, being the "splendores secundi," fit ministers of the Word; and these perfections they retained in their fall, yet they do not know the secrets of the human heart except by inference from external signs. "The devil," writes Jerome, "does not know what man thinks in his heart, unless he learns from some external motion in what object each one takes his delight, and then he makes diverse suggestions in accordance with what he observes." [19] And Cassian: "No one doubts that the impure spirits can know the nature of our thoughts, although only in so far as they gather this knowledge from external signs, that is, by observing our disposition, our words, and the tendencies of our desires. But for the rest,

[16] De Civ. Dei, 12, 9, 2.
[17] De Virgin. 5.
[18] De Gen. ad Lit. 11, 14, 18.
[19] In Ps. 16, 20.

those things which are entirely hidden in the soul they cannot touch." [20]

That the good angels were appointed by God to be our guardians, whilst the evil ones endeavor to encompass our destruction, is admitted by all. Gregory of Nyssa thus sets forth the common view: "There is a teaching, based upon the tradition of the Fathers, which holds that after our nature had fallen into sin, God did not leave our misery without protection, but that an angel, one of those incorporeal spirits, was appointed by Him to assist each one of us during life; and that, on the other hand, the corrupter of our nature plies his machinations through some wicked and malevolent demon for the purpose of destroying the life of man. Placed between these two spirits, each one of which draws him on to opposite ends, man has it in his power to decide which of them shall prevail. The good spirit suggests thoughts of virtue, which lead to a well founded hope; whilst the other one brings before him sordid delights, in which there is no hope of good, dragging him down to the desire of temporal things and to the sensual slavery of the foolish." [21]

These are the principal points touched upon by the fourth and fifth century writers in their teaching concerning the angels. They comprise practically all we know of the matter to-day. Excepting the practice of special devotions to the angels on the part of the faithful, which in some cases have been approved by the Church, there has been but little development along these lines of Christian thought.

B — Anthropology

Justin Martyr defined man as a reasonable being composed

[20] Coll. 7, 15.

[21] De Vita Moysis, P. G. 44, 337. It is interesting to notice that over a hundred years before the time of Gregory, Origen had set forth this doctrine in almost identical terms. "With every one of us," he says, "there are present two angels, the one an angel of justice, the other a spirit of iniquity. If good thoughts arise in our hearts, and justice begins to spring up in our souls, there can be no doubt but that the angel of the Lord is speaking. But if, on the contrary, evil reigns in our hearts, the angel of the devil is speaking to us. And as there are thus two angels with individual men, thus, I am of opinion, there are also two angels in the various

of soul and body.[22] This definition was in one way or another repeated by most subsequent writers. Even Clement of Alexandria, who is commonly accused of having held that man is made up of body, soul, and spirit, says quite definitely: "Man is composed of a rational and an irrational part, of soul and body."[23] With this view the fourth-century Fathers, excepting Didymus the Blind in the East and Victorinus Afer in the West, both of whom seem to have been trichotomists, were in perfect accord. They all held that the two constitutive elements in man are his spiritual soul and his material body, from the intimate union of which results the *animal rationale* called man.

Speaking of man's origin, they usually restate what is contained in Holy Scripture, accepting without demur that "the Lord God formed man of the slime of the earth, and breathed into his face the breath of life." This last statement, however, was not accepted by all in the same sense. Didymus revived the view of Origen, that souls were created before their union with the body, and that consequently this breathing of the soul into man's face signifies simply a subsequent imprisonment of the soul, as a punishment for sins committed in a previous state of existence.[24] This same view was also entertained by Victorinus.[25] The other writers of this period, on the contrary, interpreted the same statement as a creative act of God; although Epiphanius, who held indeed that Adam's soul was created, seems to have been at a loss how to understand the text in question.[26]

Regarding the origin of the first man's soul, then, all were at one: it was created by God. But what of the souls of Adam's posterity? Are they also created? Or are they in some way derived from the children's parents in the act of generation, *ex traduce seminis*? Among Eastern writers Gregory of Nyssa seems to have been inclined to hold this

different countries, endeavoring to make them either good or bad" (In Luc. Hom. 12).

[22] De Resurr. 8.

[23] Strom. 4, 3.

[24] Enarr. in I Petri, 1, 1.

[25] In Epist. ad Ephes. 1, 4.

[26] Ancor. 55.

latter view,[27] whilst the others stood for the creation of individual souls. Of the West St. Jerome affirms that the greater number follow Tertullian and Apollinaris, asserting that "the same way as the body is born of the body, the soul is born of the soul, and subsists under the same conditions as brute animals."[28] This, however, is undoubtedly an exaggeration, especially in the wholly material sense in which Tertullian understood Traducianism. As St. Augustine rightly points out, such a derivation would make the soul corporeal, and this no well instructed Christian could admit.[29] At any rate, Jerome himself, Ambrose, Hilary, Zeno, Victorinus, and others who touched this question, agreed with their Eastern contemporaries in defending Creationism. Augustine indeed was undecided, but only for practical reasons, not seeing his way how to explain the transmission of original sin if individual souls are created by God. Hence whilst rejecting the gross Traducianism of Tertullian, he viewed the derivation of souls *ex traduce seminis* in a more spiritual sense, and retained it as a working hypothesis till the end of his life. In this he was followed by other Latin writers up to the Middle Ages.

With the exception of the followers of Tertullian, both Eastern and Western writers admitted the spirituality of the soul. They also defended the soul's natural immortality, which was not affected by Adam's fall into sin. This, together with his intellect and free will, constitutes man's natural likeness to God.

A somewhat more difficult question is that of man's primitive condition. Was Adam before his fall endowed only with natural perfections, or had he over and above received others that placed him in a preternatural state? And if the latter, were any of these gifts of a strictly supernatural order? In what precise light did the fourth and fifth-century writers view Adam's condition in paradise?

There is no particular difficulty about the first question, if the term preternatural be taken in a somewhat wider sense,

[27] De Hom. Opif. 29.
[28] Ep. 82.
[29] Ep. 190 (al. 157) ad Optat. 2, 14.

so as to signify simply a condition of existence which was lost through the sin of Adam. For all these writers are at one in holding that we are now living in a world wholly unlike that which came from the creative hand of God. Blindness of the intellect, perversion of the will, anguish of soul, pains of body, sickness and want, are the bitter fruit of our first parents' sin. There was nothing of all this in that garden of pleasure which God in His goodness had prepared for the progenitors of our race. They were made right, the material world ministered to their pleasure, and their lives were bright with the love and familiar intercourse of God. About this there is no dissentient voice.

Furthermore, they are also agreed that man was originally endowed with immortality of body, so that if he had not sinned, he would never have tasted death. And yet, on the other hand, they admit that death is natural to man, although in the present order it is the consequence of sin. Man is a compound being, made up of body and soul, whose union may be dissolved by a proportionate finite cause. Nay, his very organism requires that he gradually develop to his full strength, enjoy for a little while the perfection of his manhood, and then by degrees grow feeble with age, until at last his body returns to the dust. Hence, although these writers did not theorize much about the matter, they in effect regarded man's primitive immortality as a preternatural gift, as something not due to his nature. And in the same light also did they view his impassibility, and his immunity from concupiscence. In this, again, they are practically unanimous.

The real difficulty begins when the term preternatural is taken in a stricter sense, as synonymous with supernatural. Immortality of body, impassibility, immunity from concupiscence, although not due to human nature as such, are nevertheless entirely within the range of its unelevated capacities. Their bestowal does not necessarily imply an elevation of man to an essentially higher state. But it is otherwise with gifts that are *in se* or entitatively supernatural, as is that of sanctifying grace. Thereby man in his spiritual aspect is lifted to a divine plane of being, becoming a partaker of the divine

nature. And here the question is, whether the writers now under consideration held that such a gift had been bestowed upon our first parents. If so, then they must have considered man's primitive state to have been strictly supernatural.

Harnack, in his *History of Dogmas,* is at great pains to show that the Greeks made no room for the supernatural, whenever they were occupied with cosmological speculations. With them the supernatural, in this connection, he says, was the same as the spiritual. They had no notion of a gift that reached beyond the natural capacity of our first parents. He grants, however, that aside from such cosmological speculations they presented the matter in a different light. Thus they proved themselves perfectly capable of grasping and describing the specific significance of the grace brought us by Christ; and some of them, he admits, held that a similar grace had been bestowed upon the ancestors of our race.[30]

Although these statements contain some half-truths which necessarily lead to false inferences, nevertheless they also give us the key to the problem now under consideration. It is this. When the Fathers, and this is true of the Latins as well as of the Greeks, were directly engaged in discussing man's primitive condition, they as a general rule did not emphasize the strictly supernatural aspect of his state. But when they spoke of the grace of redemption, they almost invariably represented it as a restoration of man to the state from which Adam had fallen by sin. This difference of treatment resulted more or less from the very nature of things. For theological science was still too undeveloped to favor speculative discussion on the natural and supernatural; whereas the grace of redemption through Christ, and its being a restoration of man to his primitive condition, were truths which they found clearly stated in Holy Scripture. The grace of redemption, moreover, even as imparted to individual souls, they looked upon as a deification of human nature, as something really and strictly supernatural. And yet this same grace, they held, had also been conferred on our first parents before the fall; for the redemption was in a

[30] Dogmengeschichte, II, 146–156.

true sense a restoration. Hence whatever may have been the tenor of these writers' "cosmological speculations," they undoubtedly held that man was in the beginning raised to the supernatural state.

Nor is it altogether true that "the Greeks in their cosmological speculations made no room for the supernatural." For as early as the beginning of the third century, St. Irenæus clearly taught that man, whilst still in paradise, was through the indwelling of the Holy Spirit a supernatural image and likeness of God. That deprived of grace by sin, he retained indeed the natural image; but the supernatural likeness, which God had bestowed upon him and which he was to preserve by the good use of his free will, was lost and could be restored only through the grace of Christ.[31] And hence he represents Adam after the fall thus soliloquizing at seeing himself clad in the skins of beasts: "The stole of sanctity, which I had received from the Holy Spirit, I have lost through disobedience, and now I know that I deserve to be covered with this garment, which indeed gives me no delight, but bites and stings the body." [32]

This interpretation of Adam's "likeness" to God was adopted by most subsequent writers, although they usually make reference to it in connection with the grace of redemption. Thus Gregory of Nyssa: "Let us return to that divine grace in which God created man at the beginning, when He said: Let us make man to our image and likeness." [33] The same is implied by Gregory of Nazianzus, when he closes his oration on Adam's glorious condition in paradise, his fall, and redemption through the Incarnate Logos, with the statement: "The culmination of it all is this: my perfection and restoration, and my return to the first Adam." [34] Similarly Basil the Great: "Through the Holy Spirit is bestowed the reinstatement in paradise, the ascent into the kingdom of heaven, the return to the adoption of children." [35] And hence the general principle laid down by the same author, and ad-

[31] Adv. Haer. 5, 6; 2, 33, 4.
[32] Ibid. 3, 23, 5.
[33] De Opif. Hom. 30.
[34] Orat. 38, 16.
[35] De Spir. Sanct. 15.

hered to by all other writers when speaking of this matter: "The (new) dispensation of God and our Saviour in regard to man is a calling back from the fall, a return to God's friendship from the estrangement brought about by disobedience." [36]

Now the grace of Christ, whereby we are restored to our primitive condition, is regarded by all these writers as strictly supernatural; not only in reference to our sinful nature, but as referred to human nature in itself. It is a deification of the creature, the adoption of the servant as God's own child. "In this consists the goodness of God," says St. Athanasius, "that He deigns to be the Father of those of whom He is the Creator. And this comes to pass, when, as the Apostle says, men created by Him receive into their hearts the Spirit of His Son, who cries out, Abba, Father! Such are all those who received the Word, and from Him have power to become the children of God. Because as they are creatures by nature, they can become sons of God only by receiving into themselves the Spirit of the natural and true Son of God. And for this purpose the Word has become flesh, to fit men for the reception of divinity." [37]

Cyril of Jerusalem uses almost the same terms. "Although," he says, "it has been granted us to say, especially in our prayers, 'Our Father who art in heaven,' yet this is a favor that comes to us from the goodness of God. For not as though we were naturally born of the Father who is in heaven, do we call Him Father; but as translated by the grace of the Father from servitude to adoption, through the Son and the Holy Spirit, is it conceded to us by His ineffable bounty so to address Him." [38] His namesake of Alexandria is even more explicit, when he points out that this "deification is beyond the natural capacity of all created nature. This incomprehensible new creation can be attributed only to God, who permits the souls of the saints to share His own divinity through the Holy Spirit, through whom we become conformable to His natural Son." [39]

[36] Ibid. 15, 35.
[37] Contr. Arian. 2, 59.
[38] Catech. 7, 7.
[39] Contr. Eunom. 3, 7; cfr. Athan. Ad Serap.; Greg. Naz. Orat. 34.

How this deification of nature, this human participation of the divinity, is to be understood, appears from the exposition of John Damascene, who interpreted the writings of the earlier Fathers. "Man," he says, "is deified through grace, in as much as he shares in the divine enlightenment, and not because his being is changed into the nature of God."[40] Human nature remains human nature, but it is elevated to a divine plane; it is, so to speak, admitted into God's own family circle.

With this teaching of the Eastern Fathers, their Western contemporaries are in perfect accord. They all subscribed to the saying of Tertullian that we are gods, not by our own nature, but through God's grace. "Those," says Ambrose, "in whom God sees His Son, His own Image, He admits through the Son to the grace of sonship: so that as through the image we are to the image, so through the generation of the Son are we called to the grace of adoption."[41]

The whole matter is thus clearly explained by Augustine, of whose teaching on divine grace and the state of original justice something more will be said in another chapter. Speaking of the grace of the New Law, he says: "This birth (through grace) is spiritual, and therefore not of blood, not of the will of man, nor of the will of the flesh, but of God. And this birth is called adoption. For we were something before we became the sons of God, and we received grace that we might become what we were not; even as he who is adopted, before adoption was not yet the son of him by whom he is adopted, nevertheless he was already such a one as might be adopted. And from this generation through grace must that Son be set apart, who, when He was the Son of God, came to be made the Son of man and to bestow upon us, who were the sons of men, the grace to become the sons of God. He was indeed made what He was not, but nevertheless He was something else; and this very something was the Word of God, through which all things were made, and the true light, which enlighteneth every man that cometh into this world, and God with God. We also through His grace were made what we were

[40] De Fide Orth. 2, 12. [41] De Fide, 5, 3.

not, that is, sons of God; but still we were something, and this same something much inferior, that is, sons of men. He therefore descended that we might ascend, and remaining in His own nature was made partaker of our nature, so that we, remaining in our nature, might be made partakers of His nature." [42]

With all this, however, it is very true that the Fathers did not enter into any speculative consideration of the nature of divine grace. They took a practical view of the matter, and built upon the data supplied by Holy Scripture. But, on the other hand, it is not less true that they had a very definite concept of the elevation of human nature through the grace of Christ, and they either explicitly affirmed or evidently implied a similar elevation when speaking of our first parents before the fall. Hence although there is truth in Tixeront's remark concerning the Greek Fathers, that "from all their affirmations (in reference to man's primitive condition) one can hardly draw a single precise and well connected theory," still it does not eliminate the further truth that in their view of the matter our first parents were elevated above their natural condition, and that along with this elevation, or in consequence of it, they were made the recipients of favors and gifts which were all lost through sin.

[42] Epist. 140 (al. 412); cfr. Retract. 2, 32.

CHAPTER XX

THE WORD INCARNATE: THE REDEMPTION OF THE WORLD

The fourth century Fathers, especially those of the East, set forth their views on the Word Incarnate chiefly in two different connections: First, whilst arguing against the Apollinarian heresy, according to which the humanity of Christ was imperfect, in the sense that the Word had taken the place of the rational soul; secondly, when speaking of the redemption of the world, from which they drew a special argument for the divinity of Christ. The tenets of Apollinaris have already been explained in a previous chapter, hence in this place we need do no more than briefly set down the teaching of orthodox writers on the person of the Saviour; and to this we may appropriately add their views on the work of redemption, as in their minds the two were intimately connected.

A — The Word Incarnate

Practically the same men who defended the Church's doctrine on the Trinity against the various forms of Arianism, also defended her teaching on the God-Man against Apollinarianism. Their line of argument may, for brevity's sake, be reduced to the following points.

1°. "He who before the ages existed as God the Word, became man at Nazareth. He was born of the Virgin Mary and the Holy Spirit, in Bethlehem of Juda, of the seed of David, of Abraham, and of Adam, as it is written; and He took from the Virgin whatever God in the beginning fashioned and contributed to the constitution of man, sin alone excepted." [1] This was effected not by a change of the divinity,

[1] Athan. Contr. Apoll. 2, 5.

but by a renovation of the humanity; "so that man might be truly God, and God might be truly man, and that He should be true man and true God." [2] The union between the human nature of Christ and the divinity of the Word had its beginning at the moment of conception in the Virgin's womb, so that in the union itself the human nature began to exist.[3]

2°. This human nature of the Saviour was in every sense consubstantial with ours: because otherwise "we who had died in Adam would not have been made alive in Christ; that which was broken would not have been restored; that which by the serpent's lie had been estranged would not have been reunited to God." [4] For "that alone is healed which has been assumed by the Word." [5] This lay in God's plan of redemption; and hence "Jesus did not give one thing for another, but a body for a body, a soul for a soul, and a complete being for a whole man." [6] This "whole man," therefore, was assumed by the Word, although the writers in question usually speak of the soul as the immediate bond of union.[7]

3°. As the Saviour's human nature is thus consubstantial with ours, it follows that as man He is subject to all our needs and weaknesses and infirmities, in so far as they naturally affect the body and the affective part of the soul. In this respect "He kept all the consequences of the Incarnation." [8] So far all these writers are agreed; but on the subject of Christ's mental perfections their agreement is not so complete. Athanasius and Nyssa admit a gradual increase of human knowledge in the Saviour, whilst Basil, Amphilochius, Didymus, Epiphanius, and Chrysostom hold that He was perfect in wisdom from the very beginning of His human life.[9] These latter explain the apparently contrary Scripture texts by postulating an economic ignorance and a progressive mani-

[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid. 1, 4.
[4] Basil, Epist. 266, 2.
[5] Greg. Naz. Epist. 101, P. G. 37, 181.
[6] Id. Contr. Apoll. 1, 17.
[7] Id. Epist. 101; Greg. Nyss. Antirrhet. 41.
[8] Didym. De Trin. 3, 21.
[9] Athan. Orat. 3 contra Arian. 54; cfr. ibid. 43, 45, 48; Nyssa, Antirrhet. 28; cfr. ibid. 24. Basil, Ep. 236, 1, 2; Amphil. Fragm. 6; Didym. De Trinit. 3, 22; Epiphan. Ancorat. 32, 38, 78; Chrysost. In Matt. Hom. 77, 1, 2.

festation of wisdom and knowledge. Gregory of Nazianzus also appears to admit that Christ as man was ignorant of some things; for arguing against the Arians, who attributed ignorance of the day of judgment to the Word Itself, he asks: "Is it not clear to all that He knew it as God, and did not know it as man?" [10] However, later writers, and among them John Damascene, interpret Gregory's words as referring to humanity as considered in itself, and not as it existed in Christ.[11]

4°. All are at one in maintaining the perfect holiness and absolute impeccability of Jesus. "He has been specially sanctified and anointed by the Holy Ghost. This sanctification the Saviour as God imparted to Himself as man: He imparted it to Himself that we too might be sanctified." [12] "He is called Christ because of the divinity; for this is the unction of the humanity, sanctifying it not by a mere passing operation, as is the case in others who are anointed, but in such wise that He who anoints (the Word) is called man, and that which is anointed (Christ as man) becomes God." [13] It was because of this substantial unction, consisting in the union of the human and the divine, that Christ was absolutely impeccable. "The incarnation of the Word, effected according to the nature of God, admitted in no sense whatever any of those things which even now cling to us from our ancient heritage, and for this reason are we taught to put off the old man and to put on the new. And in this there is a miracle, both that the Lord was made man and is without sin." [14] Hence Cyril of Alexandria, who wrote somewhat later, does not hesitate to say that "they are stupid and altogether demented who affirm that Christ could have sinned." [15]

5°. The union of the Godhead with the humanity is so intimate that the Saviour's human nature, in so far as it is united to the Godhead, is an object of adoration: "For if the flesh also is in itself a part of the created world, yet it has become

[10] Orat. 30, 15.
[11] De Fide Orthod. 3, 21.
[12] Athan. Ad Adelph. 4.
[13] Naz. Orat. 30, 21.
[14] Athan. Cont. Apollinar. 1, 17.
[15] Contra Antropomorph. 23.

God's body." [16] Still this intimate union does not change the two natures: "You must distinguish the natures, that of God and that of man: nor has Jesus advanced from the nature of man to that of God." [17] "He assumed the humanity in union with the divinity." [18] "Those words of the Saviour: I came down from heaven not to do my will, but the will of Him that sent me, must be understood in this sense, that Christ did not follow the prompting of His human will, but the will of the Godhead; for the (divine) will of the beloved Son was none other than that of God." [19] Hence there are in Christ two wills, the divine and the human, and thus both the Monophysites and the Monothelites are refuted beforehand.

7°. There is in Jesus only one person: He is at the same time both God and man. "It is to be held that Christ is perfect God and perfect man; not that the divine perfection was changed into the human, which it would be impious to say; nor that the two perfections remained separate the one from the other, which it would be equally impious to affirm; nor that the result was effected through an increase of power and an addition of justice, God forbid! But one and the same is both perfect God and perfect man." [20] On this all are agreed, and they are quite familiar with the *communicatio idiomatum,* predicating of the same Christ both human and divine attributes; but the particulars are more clearly set forth by Gregory of Nazianzus. Thus in order to prove that Mary is truly Theotokos, the Mother of God, he points to the fact that it was the Son of God who took flesh in her womb and was born of her, and then continues: "In one word, the Saviour is indeed made up of different elements, for the invisible and the visible are not the same, nor the eternal and the temporal; but for all this He is not other and other, not two persons, God forbid! For the two elements have become one in union, God taking to Himself human nature, and human nature being united to the divinity, or however one should express it. I say different elements, for in the Incarnation we

[16] Athan. Ad Adelph. 3.
[17] Amphiloch. fragm. 9.
[18] Epiphan. Ancor, 75.
[19] Amphiloch. De Trin. 3, 12.
[20] Athan. De Incarn. 1, 16.

have the reverse of what we find in the Trinity; because there we acknowledge another and another, so as not to confound the persons, but not different elements, since the three are one and the same Godhead." [21] This teaching refutes in advance the Nestorian heresy, which was to make its appearance half a century later.

8°. Hence, according to the common teaching of these theologians, the union between the human and the divine elements in Christ is in some way a personal union, since it results in oneness of person; but in what that personal union precisely consists, how it is still further to be explained, they do not undertake to say. Here and there we find general statements that seem to point the way to an ultimate explanation, as far as such an explanation is possible; but they hardly go to the root of the matter. Thus Athanasius says that "the Word has not changed the humanity, but has made the humanity and what belonged to it His own. The humanity was not the Word, but it was the humanity of the Word." [22] The same view is expressed by Gregory of Nyssa when he writes: "By reason of the natural contact and union the wounds and the honors are common to each element, the Lord receiving the stripes of the servant, and the servant being glorified by the honors of the Lord." [23] These and similar statements, which occur frequently in the works of all these writers, indicate with sufficient clearness that the union was regarded as being in the physical order. Of a merely moral union they knew nothing. No definite theory regarding the nature of this physical union was advanced, but the very fact that it was explained as resulting into unity of person without destroying the duality of natures shows that it was considered to be hypostatic.

This, then, represents the Christological teaching of the East, as determined more or less by the aberrations of Apollinaris and his followers; but with it the Christology of the West during the same period of time was in full accord, although in Western lands the heresy of Apollinaris was hardly known. In fact, Latin Christology had already been formu-

[21] Ep. 101.
[22] Ad Epictet. 6.
[23] Cont. Eunom. 5.

lated by Tertullian at the beginning of the third century, when he wrote the terse sentence: "Videmus duplicen statum, non confusum, sed conjunctum in una persona, Deum et hominem Jesum." "We see a twofold state, not confused, but conjoined in one person, God and the man Jesus." Those who came after him did little more than expand this epigrammatic statement as circumstances required. A few examples will make this clear.

Thus Hilary writes: "The change in outward appearance and the assumption of human nature did not destroy the divinity, because it is one and the same Christ who assumed human nature and who appears in mortal garb." [24] Similarly Phœbadius: "What the Virgin conceived that she brought forth, God and man united into one. Each of the two substances, the divine and the human, retained its own properties and its own operations." [25] "Christ is not divided," says St. Ambrose, "but He is one; that is, one in two natures, the divine and the human: for He is not one in so far as He is of the Father, and another one in so far as He is of the Virgin; but one and the same in one way of the Father and in another way of the Virgin." [26] Of the *communicatio idiomatum* Zeno of Verona gives this striking example: "Mary conceived the Creator of the world; she brought forth a child that was before all ages. God wails as an infant, and He who was to pay the debt of the whole world allows Himself to be wrapt in swaddling-clothes. He whose eternity is not susceptible of increase in duration, passes through all the successive stages of advancing age." [27]

These men are evidently thoroughly persuaded that there is a most intimate union between the human and the divine elements in Christ, but they evince no inclination to speculate about its precise nature. They know that there are two natures in the Saviour and only one person, and also that these two natures are so closely united as to form but one being, the God-Man Christ, although each nature, notwithstanding the union, retains its own properties and its own mode of

[24] De Trin. 9, 14.
[25] Cont. Arian. 19, 4.
[26] De Incarn. 35.
[27] Tract. 2, 8, 2; 7, 4.

action. "Utramque substantiam suam," says Phœbadius, "affectus proprietate distinxit." [28] "Suscepit ergo Christus voluntatem meam," St. Ambrose infers from Christ's prayer in the garden, "suscepit tristitiam meam. Mea est voluntas quam suam dixit." [29]

On Christ's absolute sinlessness all are agreed, but with regard to the natural consequences of the Incarnation there is some discrepancy among the Western writers, as there was also among those of the East. Thus St. Hilary is inclined to believe that Christ was normally not capable of suffering, both because of the intimate union of His human nature with the Word and by reason of His virginal birth; whilst the others commonly teach that Christ came in a passible nature, and was therefore in consequence of the Incarnation subject to all our natural weaknesses and infirmities, sin alone excepted.

There is also some difference of views in regard to Christ's mental perfections. Whilst Hilary holds that Christ was perfect in all human knowledge and incapable of real progress in virtue, Jerome is inclined to look upon the progress of Jesus in wisdom and grace, of which the Evangelist speaks, as objective and real. Ambrose is rather undecided, although he favors the view taken by Hilary. In general, however, the Latin writers of this period regard the human knowledge of the Saviour as perfect, although in view of His mission it was not always communicable to others. So was He also perfect in grace, and therefore the Scripture texts that seem to imply the contrary must be understood to refer simply to a progressive outward manifestation of what was in itself perfect from the beginning.

The Christological teaching of these Western writers is also found in the works of St. Augustine, but in many instances he added some further developments of his own. The Son of God, he says, assumed a real human body from a woman, so that both sexes might overcome Satan, and that woman, who had been the cause of death, might also be the cause of life.[30] The formation of Christ's human nature is

[28] Cont. Arian. 5, 18.
[29] De Fide, 2, 53.
[30] De Agon. Christi. 20, 24.

the work of the whole Trinity, although it is rightly appropriated to the Holy Spirit.[31] Christ's was a virginal birth: "Concipiens virgo, pariens virgo, virgo gravida, virgo feta, virgo perpetua."[32] As will be noticed, this is but a summary restatement of traditions that reach back to the earliest centuries. His own contributions to Christology refer more directly to the nature of the union.

Because of the incarnation of the Word, Christ is at one and the same time perfect God and perfect man. He is perfect God by reason of the person assuming, and perfect man by reason of the nature assumed; not that the one was in any way changed into the other, but because the union is so intimate that the two natures, though remaining distinct, are possessed by one person as His very own. "The same who is God is also man, and the same who is man is also God, not by a confusion of natures, but by the unity of person."[33] And this union took place at the moment of conception, so that He who was born of the Virgin was truly Son of God. "The man (in Christ) was never man in such a way that He was not also the only-begotten Son of God, on account of the only-begotten Word."[34] Hence, even as man, Christ cannot be called an adopted Son of God. And this inference the author states explicitly: "Read the Scriptures, nowhere will you find it said of Christ that He is God's adopted Son. There are not two sons of God, God and man, but one Son of God."[35]

Yet the humanity of Christ, which is thus incapable of divine adoption, is complete and perfect, consisting not only of a body, living and sensitive, but also of a rational soul. "For there was in Christ a human soul, a whole soul, not only the irrational part, but also the rational which is called mind."[36] Hence the logical inference is that the union was hypostatic, for this alone would make adoption impossible. And this seems to be the author's consistent view, in spite of his occasionally comparing the union with that which makes

[31] Enchir. 38–40.
[32] Serm. 186, 1.
[33] Ibid.
[34] Opus Imperf. 1, 138.
[35] Cont. Sec. 5.
[36] In Joan. tract. 23, 6.

soul and body one being. God Himself, he says, remains God, but man is united to God, and there results one person; not so that Christ be half God and half man, but perfect God and perfect man, possessing the two natures in the unity of person.[37] To this exposition the later Scholastics could add but little.

The Christological teaching of these centuries is summed up in the Athanasian Symbol as follows: "But for eternal salvation it is necessary that one also faithfully believe the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. The right faith therefore is this, that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and Man. He is God begotten before the ages of the substance of the Father, and He is man born in time of the substance of His mother. Perfect God, perfect man: subsisting in a rational soul and human flesh. Equal to the Father according to the divinity: less than the Father according to the humanity. Who, although God and man, is nevertheless not two, but one Christ. One not by a conversion of the divinity into the flesh, but by an assumption of the humanity into God. Altogether one, not by a confusion of substance, but by the unity of person. For as the rational soul and the flesh is one man, so is God and man one Christ." Of course, this symbol did not then have the force of a definition of the faith, but as it was shortly after the fifth century quite generally accepted, in the East as well as in the West, it bears a most valuable testimony to the faith of those times.

B — The Redemption of the World

Nearly all the writers referred to in the preceding section drew their arguments for the divinity of Christ from the nature of His redemptive work. They looked upon it as more or less self-evident that if Christ was really the Redeemer of the world, who lifted up the fallen race and reunited it to God, then He Himself must be God. Sin had corrupted human nature in its inmost being, and this corruption could not be

[37] De Civit. Dei, 12, 2.

done away with, except the nature so corrupted be brought into physical contact with the Godhead. Not that this was absolutely necessary for the forgiveness of sin, but it was required for the full restoration of our fallen nature to its union with God. Hence these writers infer the necessity of the Incarnation from the redeeming will of the all-merciful Father. He wished to save sinful man, therefore His only-begotten Son must assume human nature and through it accomplish man's redemption. It is true, as they all admit, He could have saved the world in other ways, but none would have been as suitable and as effective in remedying the disastrous consequences of sin; therefore, presupposing the redeeming will of God and taking it in its fullest sense, as we are entitled to do from the teaching of Holy Scripture, the Incarnation was a matter of necessity. This seems to have been the common view of all these theologians, as will appear more clearly from a brief summary of their teaching on the subject of redemption.

In the Antenicene writers two aspects of the redemption are usually brought out very prominently. The first is that Christ was the representative of the fallen race, the second Adam, who in some way gathered up all mankind in Himself, so that in His death for sin all died with Him and were thereby restored to newness of life. This is much insisted on by St. Irenæus, who comes back to it in several places. Thus speaking of what the Incarnation of the Word really means, he says: "When He was incarnate and made man, He summed up in Himself the long roll of the human race, securing for us all a summary salvation, so that we should regain in Christ Jesus what we had lost in Adam, namely, the being in the image and likeness of God." [38] The other view represented Christ as the juridical substitute for the fallen race, who in the place of sinners made satisfaction to God for the offences committed against His sovereign majesty. This we find already considerably developed in the Letter to Diognetus. Referring to the Incarnation as "a grand and unspeakable thing," the author continues: "O the boundless

[38] Adv. Haer. 5, 21, 1.

love of God! He hated us not, nor did He cast us away, nor did He take revenge. On the contrary, He suffered us to be, and yet more, moved by mercy, He loaded Himself with our sins, and gave His own Son as a redemption for us, the Holy for the wicked, the Blameless for the guilty, the Righteous for the unrighteous, the Incorruptible for the corruptible, the Immortal for mortal men; for what else could have blotted out our sins save His righteousness? Who could have justified us impious sinners save only the Son of God?" [39] As is evident, both of these views are based upon the teaching of St. Paul.

At the beginning of the third century two other aspects of the redemption came into prominence. In the one, which is developed to some extent by Origen, there is question of a ransom being paid to Satan for the liberation of sinful man from his slavery. By the free exercise of his will, man had yielded to the inducements set before him by Satan, and thus sold himself into captivity. God could indeed have liberated him by force, but it was more in accord with His justice that He should do so by the payment of a ransom. This consisted in the death of Jesus, in as much as Satan instigated the Jews to crucify Him unjustly, and for that he was rightly deprived of his dominion over man. In the other view the sanctification of the human race through the Incarnation itself is emphasized. Origen speaks of it as follows: "Since the Incarnation the divine and the human nature began to be woven together, in order that the human nature might become divine through a communication with the more divine, not only in Jesus but also in all those who along with belief receive the life which Jesus taught." [40]

In the course of the fourth century these different views, which had till then been stated more or less casually, were gradually reduced to three separate theories concerning the redemption. The first is known as the Physical or Mystical Theory, according to which the Incarnation itself has in some way a redemptive value, in as much as sinful human nature

[39] Ad Diognet. 9. [40] Cont. Cels. 3, 28.

by its contact with the divinity, through the humanity of the God-Man, is cleansed and sanctified and raised to new life. This was much favored by St. Athanasius and St. Gregory of Nyssa. The former says: "Just as when a great king has entered some important city and takes up his dwelling in the houses thereof, such a city is certainly deemed worthy of honor, and no enemy or bandit any more attacks or overpowers it, but it is counted worthy of all respect because of the king who has taken up his dwelling in one of its houses; so it has happened in the case of the King of all. For since He came into our domain and took up His dwelling in a body like ours, attacks of enemies upon men have entirely ceased, and the corruption of death which of old prevailed against them has vanished away." [41]

The second, whilst not excluding the foregoing, lays special stress on the sufferings and death of the Saviour, as a satisfaction offered to the justice of God. Man by his sins contracted a debt with God which he was unable to pay; hence the sinless Christ substitutes Himself for sinful man, offering a condign and superabundant satisfaction to God's offended majesty. This is usually called the Realistic or Substitution Theory. It was strongly defended by Basil, Didymus, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Chrysostom, and was admitted by all the others. A few citations will be sufficient to show us the mind of these writers.

Thus Basil, drawing from the redemption an argument for the divinity of Christ, says: "Moses did not deliver his people from sin, he was unable even to offer an expiation to God for himself when he was in sin. Hence it is not from a man that we must expect this expiation, but from one who surpasses our nature, from Jesus Christ the God-Man, who alone can offer God a sufficient expiation for us all." [42] Similarly Gregory of Nazianzus: "He delivers us from the power of sin by giving Himself in our stead as a ransom which cleanses the world." [43] And again: "Just as He became a curse and sin for my salvation, He made Himself into a

[41] De Incarn. 9.
[42] In Ps. 48, 3-4.
[43] Orat. 30, 20.

second Adam instead of the old; He took unto Himself and made His own our rebellion, as the head of the whole body. On the cross it was not He who was forsaken; He occupied our own position; it was ourselves who were abandoned and despised; He saved us by His sufferings, for He made our sins His own." [44] With this Gregory of Nyssa connects Christ's priesthood: "With His own blood He presented the priestly expiation for sin. He sacrificed His own body for the sins of the world. He humbled Himself in the form of a servant and offered Himself in sacrifice for us." [45]

The third theory that began to be rather common during the fourth century is styled the Satan's Rights Theory, to which reference was made in a preceding paragraph. It was strongly emphasized by Gregory of Nyssa, and frequently made use of by most of the others in their sermons to the people. Gregory of Nazianzus, however, rejects it absolutely. "Was the ransom paid to the evil one?" he asks indignantly; "it is a monstrous thought. If to the evil one, what an outrage? Then the robber receives a ransom, not only from God, but one which consists of God Himself, and for his usurpation he gets so illustrious a payment — a payment for which it would have been right to have left us alone altogether." [46] No doubt, if put in this way, the thought is "monstrous," but most of these writers used it for oratorical purposes, emphasizing the teaching of the Apostle that he who sins becomes the servant of sin; and in this sense, barring a few oratorical exaggerations, there was nothing "monstrous" about either the thought or its popular presentation.

The fruit of the redemption is placed by all in man's restitution to the place whence he had fallen by sin. It gives back to him what he had lost, frees him from sin and death, restores immortality, and deifies him. "Jesus, who was God's own Son, became son of man in order to make the sons of men children of God." [47]

With this teaching the Western writers are in perfect agree-

[44] Ibid. 5.
[45] Cont. Eunom. 6.
[46] Orat. 45, 22.
[47] Chrysost. In Joan. Hom. 2, 1; cfr. Athan. Ad Adeph. 4.

ment; however, they usually emphasize the Realistic or Substitution Theory of redemption. "As all men," says Ambrose, "were held in an hereditary bondage, it was necessary that Jesus should take up our cause, should be substituted for us, and that, assuming the debt of us all and becoming our security, He should suffer, atone, and pay in the name and stead of us all." [48] But this substitution was entirely voluntary on the part of Christ. "He offered Himself to the death of the accursed," writes Hilary, "so that He might remove the curse of the law, presenting Himself voluntarily as a victim to God the Father." [49] The satisfaction which He thus rendered was a superabundant atonement and redemption for all the sins of the world.[50] It was a true sacrifice of propitiation: "For according to the Apostle He is our peace-offering, in whose blood we have been reconciled to God." [51]

To this teaching St. Augustine added little by way of further development. His leading thesis is: "If man had not perished, the Son of man would not have come." [52] Hence, the redemption of mankind from sin forms the primary motive of the Incarnation. Christ came indeed also to manifest God's wisdom, and to give us an example of right living, but all this is secondary.[53] In our utter misery, resulting from sin, God wished to give us hope, and he had no more effective means of doing this than to show us what a price He was willing to pay for our redemption. Hence, the Son, whom He had begotten from His own substance, entered into fellowship with our nature, bore our sins, endured all our ills, and opened up for us again the way to eternal life.[54] Hence, the Incarnation, in all its aims and purposes, is a work of love. And this love of God does not merely result from the Incarnation, but preceded it as a motive cause. "For it was not from the time that we were reconciled to Him by the blood of His Son that He began to love us; but He loved us from the foundation of the World. . . . We were reconciled

[48] In Ps. 118; De Incarn. 60.
[49] In Ps. 53, 13.
[50] Ambrose, In Ps. 48, 13–15.
[51] Id. In Ps. 54, 4.
[52] Serm. 174, 2.
[53] In Joan. tract. 98, 3.
[54] De Trin. 13, 13.

unto Him who already loved us, but with whom we were at enmity because of our sins." [55]

In his further development of the subject, St. Augustine considers the redemption under many different aspects. Christ is our substitute, He paid our ransom, He gave satisfaction for our sins, He offered for us a propitiatory sacrifice.[56] In principle the redemption is universal, but in fact those only profit by it who are willing to do so.[57]

In this condition the doctrine of the atonement remained during the rest of the Patristic age, except that the Substitution Theory of redemption was gradually gaining ground. The one point that was ever retained, and which had been emphasized from the very beginning of Christianity, was the fact of the redemption itself. Christ truly redeemed us from sin, and through Him were we reconciled to the Father.

[55] Tract. In Joan 90, 6.
[56] Cfr. Cont. Faust. 14, 6, 7; De Trin. 13, 21; 4, 17.
[57] Serm. 244, 5.

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

CHAPTER XXI

THE DONATIST HERESY: ECCLESIOLOGY[1]

From the very beginning of Christianity it was a cardinal point of orthodox teaching that the fruits of the redemption were laid up in the Church of Christ, that salvation was made dependent on her ministrations, and that therefore Christian life must necessarily bear a social aspect. This idea, which is indeed fundamental in Christ's message to the world, was in course of time more and more emphasized in proportion as heresies and schisms threatened to rend asunder the unity of the Church. On such occasions it became necessary for the defenders of orthodoxy and Church unity to place the social aspect of Christianity in the foreground, and to clear up ideas on ecclesiastical government and sacerdotal powers. During the fourth century this work devolved largely on the theologians of the West, as it was chiefly there that the Donatist schism brought the question to an issue. Besides, during this period, as was indicated in the preceding chapters, the East was kept busy with its Trinitarian and Christological controversies, and so the discussion of ecclesiological problems was in large measure left to Western theologians.

The Donatist schism, which affected chiefly the Church in Africa, dated from the beginning of the fourth century, and was indirectly a result of Diocletian's persecution. In 311 the archdeacon Cæcilian was elected successor to Mensurius, the late bishop of Carthage. He was consecrated by Felix of Aptonga, whom many regarded as a *traditor,* because he was reported to have given up the Holy Books during the persecution. Professedly on this account a strong party was formed

[1] Cfr. Leclercq, L'Afrique Chrétienne, I; *Bethune-Baker, An Introduction to the Early History of Christian Doctrine, 357–375; Tixeront, H. D. II, 220–229.

against Cæcilian, though the opposition to him seems to have been instigated by a certain Lucilla, a rich lady, whom he had somehow offended. In the following year about seventy bishops gathered at Carthage, and although not a few of them were themselves *traditores,* they deposed Cæcilian and in his stead consecrated Majorinus, who was of the household of Lucilla. Two years later Majorinus was succeeded by Donatus, from whom the party took its name. On account of his strict asceticism and singular executive ability, he is known to history as Donatus the Great. He thoroughly organized the party and wrote voluminously in its defense. Soon the whole of Proconsular Africa and Numidia were involved in the strife. Pope and Emperor tried repeatedly to settle the dispute, but it dragged its weary length through the whole of the fourth century. In spite of the condemnation passed upon the schismatics, first by a commission of bishops at Rome, in 313, and then by the Council of Arles, in 314, the party increased so rapidly that by the middle of the century it counted over 300 bishops. It was only through the patient efforts of St. Augustine, in the first quarter of the fifth century, that peace was finally restored.

Although it is rather difficult to absolve the Donatists from the reproach of heresy, still Augustine always treated them merely as schismatics. The doctrinal points involved in the dispute bore chiefly upon the Church and the administration of the sacraments. Public and notorious sinners, it was contended, do not belong to the Church; and outside the true Church, by which of course the Donatist sect was understood, no sacraments can be administered validly. The first of these contentions the sectaries tried to defend by adducing the statement of St. Paul, that Christ disposed unto Himself a holy Church, not having spot or wrinkle. This should logically have led them to exclude all secret sinners as well, but for reasons of their own they maintained that it applied to public and notorious sinners only. Their second contention they based upon the principle that no one can give what he himself does not possess. The sacraments, they said, belong to the Church, and therefore they can be validly administered only

by a member of her communion. In this, moreover, they appealed to the authority of St. Cyprian, who some sixty years before had taken a similar stand.

It was chiefly in connection with these contentions of the Donatists that the Western theologians found occasion to set forth their ideas on the Church of Christ, and to explain somewhat in detail points of doctrine which had till then been referred to only in a general way. However before examining into this, it may be well to give a brief outline of what was taught on this subject by contemporary writers in the East, whose views were not influenced by the Donatist controversy. This will make it more easy to detect the particular developments of doctrine that resulted from the discussion. The following points will suffice for the purpose:

1°. Although the Eastern writers of this period did not treat the matter professedly, still their casual references to it show with sufficient clearness that they adhered closely to the traditional view, already somewhat developed during the second and third centuries. According to this, the Church is the spouse of Christ, the mother of His children, the depository of the spiritual treasures which were purchased by the redemption. Thence is inferred the unity of the Church, and the obligation incumbent upon all to belong to her communion. This union is destroyed not only by heretics who alter her doctrines, but also by schismatics who refuse to acknowledge her authority. For the Church is infallible in her teaching, she is the pillar and groundwork of the truth, and was destined by Christ to spread over all the world and to embrace all mankind.[2]

2°. The Church is Catholic not only in her universality, but also in opposition to the sects. "When you are traveling to other cities," St. Cyril of Jerusalem tells his hearers, "do not ask simply where is the *Dominicum,* the House of the Lord; for the impious and heretical sects also designate their dens by this name; nor ask simply where is the Church, but where is the Catholic Church: because this is the proper name

[2] Cfr. Chrysost. In Ep. ad Ephes. Hom. 11, 5; In Matt. Hom. 54, 2; Greg. Naz. Orat. 18, 6; Cyril, Catech. 18, 23.

of this holy mother, the mother of us all." [3] St. Epiphanius brings out this same point. "We never heard," he says, "of Petrines, or Paulines, or Bartholomæans, or Thadæans, but from the first there was one preaching of all the Apostles, not preaching themselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord. Wherefore also all gave one name to the Church, not their own, but that of their Lord Jesus Christ, since they began to be called Christians first at Antioch; which is the sole Catholic Church, having naught else but what is Christ's, being a church of Christians; not of Christs, but of Christians; He being one, they are from that one called Christians. Besides this church and her preachers, there are none others of such a character, as is shown by their own epithets, Manichæans, and Simonians, and Valentinians, and Ebionites." [4]

It is to this Church that the name "One Holy Catholic" belongs. To this all bear witness. Besides, the four notes of the Church, which are defended as essential in Catholic theology to-day, are thus given in the symbol ascribed to the Council of Constantinople, held in 381: "We confess One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church." This symbol, which most likely had its origin in the church of Jerusalem, was approved by the council just mentioned, and implicitly also by that of Chalcedon in 451, shortly after which it was received into the liturgy. Its teaching, therefore, embodies the common view of Eastern theologians during these centuries.

3°. The government of the Church is hierarchial, and the distinction between the higher orders is not merely a matter of ecclesiastical legislation. It involves a difference of powers which were conceded by God. Thus Epiphanius writes: "To say that priests and bishops are equal is the height of stupidity, as is plain to any prudent man. For how could this be? The order of the episcopacy has for its object to beget fathers, for it brings forth fathers to the Church; but the presbyterate, as it cannot beget fathers, brings forth children to the Church through the laver of regeneration; not, however, fathers and teachers. And how is it possible that he should

[3] Ibid. 26. [4] Panar. 42.

appoint any one as priest, who has not the power to make him such by the imposition of hands?" [5]

4°. The Church was founded on Peter, who established his episcopal see at Rome, and died there after having governed the faithful since his arrival in the imperial city during twenty-five years. This view is recorded by Eusebius and seems to have been universally accepted.[6] The Primacy of Peter is frequently alluded to by fourth century writers in the East, and some of them grow quite enthusiastic when they refer to his prerogatives as prince of the Apostles. They all agree with St. Ephrem, who impersonating Christ thus addresses Simon Peter: "Simon, my disciple, I have placed thee as the foundation of my Holy Church. Before I called thee Rock, because thou shalt bear up the whole building. Thou art the overseer of those who shall build up for me the Church upon the earth. If they are minded to build badly, do thou as the foundation restrain them. Thou art the head of that fountain from which my doctrine is drawn, thou art the head of my disciples; through thee will I give drink to all the nations. Thine is that vivifying sweetness which I bestow. Thee have I chosen to be the first-born in my dispensation, the heir of my treasures; to thee have I given the keys of my kingdom. Behold, I have placed thee as the chief stewart over all my treasures." [7]

5°. From this double fact, that Peter had established his see at Rome and that he had received charge over the whole Church, the inference was as obvious as it was inevitable that the Bishop of Rome held the Primacy over all the churches that claimed communion with the Church of Christ. And this inference was clearly drawn by the bishops of the East, although they gave expression to it by their acts rather than in words. Thus when Dionysius of Alexandria was suspected of heresy, his own church reported him to the Bishop of Rome, who unhesitatingly called him to account, and Dionysius rendered his account without a thought of ques-

[5] Ibid. 75, 4.
[6] Hist. Eccl. 2, 14; 15.
[7] Serm. in Hebd. Sanct. 4, 1; cfr. Didym. De Trin. 1, 27, 30; Epiph. Anchor. 9, 34; Id. De Iudic. 7.

tioning the Pope's authority in the matter. When Athanasius was persecuted by the Eusebians, "he sought refuge in Rome as in a most safe harbor of his communion." And when Pope Julius a little later reprimanded the Eusebians for their unjust deposition of Athanasius, and asked them as one having authority, "do you not know that this is the custom, that you should first write to us, and that what is right should be settled here?"—this, as is stated by the Greek historians Sozomon and Socrates, who make mention of it, caused no surprise to any one."[8] It was precisely what all the world somehow took for granted as the proper course to be taken by the incumbent of Blessed Peter's see. And thus scores of other instances might be cited, all of which show that Rome's preëminence was generally acknowledged in Eastern countries, although in the heat of the conflict it was often set aside by the discontented parties.

6°. The unwarranted interference of dogmatizing emperors with the affairs of the Church gave the defenders of her rights many an opportunity of proclaiming her independence of the State in matters appertaining to her own sphere. Nor did they fail to speak out their minds boldly, when the occasion for so doing presented itself. "The domain of royalty is one thing," exclaims Chrysostom, "and the power of the priesthood is another; it excels the power of kings."[9] This, indeed, was not the language of court-bishops, but it expressed the views of all those who were faithful to their duty as shepherds of Christ's flock.

These fundamental doctrines on the nature of the Church as a social body, the importance of her position in the economy of salvation, her *de jure* independence of State interference, and the preëminence of the Bishop of Rome as a logical consequence of his acknowledged succession to Peter, were also held by contemporary Western writers, even when they set forth their views without reference to the Donatist schism. And the reason is that all of this is nothing more than a casual statement of what was found to be contained in the earliest

[8] Sozom. Hist. Eccl. 3, 8, 10; Socrat. 2, 8, 15, 17.

[9] In illud "Vidi Dominum," Hom. 4, 4, 5.

teaching of Christianity. Clement of Rome, Ignatius of Antioch, Irenæus of Lyons, and Cyprian of Carthage, had advanced the same doctrines in a manner equally as clear and emphatic. It is true, they made no direct reference to the Church's independence of State interference; but the reason of the omission is evident. The State was then pagan, and although it ventured to kill Christian believers, it did at least not presume to define Christian faith.

As the Donatist schism was practically confined to Africa, not all the Western theologians took part in the discussion. The brunt of the battle was borne by two African bishops, Opatus of Mileve and Augustine of Hippo. The former carried on the discussion chiefly with Parmenian, the successor of Donatus in the see of Carthage, and the latter with Petilian, Donatist bishop of Cirta. Besides these, however, they also met other adversaries.

It was about 370 that Opatus wrote his great work, entitled, *Contra Parmenianum Donatistam.* It comprises seven books, of which the second deals with the doctrinal aspect of the question. Its fundamental thesis is: "There is only one Church of Christ, and this is the one that is in communion with the Chair of Peter." Around this all his other expositions and arguments are ranged.[10] In order to understand and follow his argumentation, it must be borne in mind that the Donatists placed the holiness of the Church in the sanctity of her individual members, and that they made this the distinguishing mark of the true Church. Furthermore, as they recognized no holiness except in persons of their own persuasion, they claimed, logically enough, that they alone constituted the true Church of Christ. It is to this pretension that Optatus replies in the second book of his work, and then develops his views somewhat further in the seventh.

Starting from the general concepts, then current both in the West and in the East, that the Church is "the house of God where His children dwell," "Christ's mystical body of which the faithful are members," "the same to-day and yes-

[10] Cont. Parmen. II, 28.

terday, and till the end of time," He points out that she is recognized chiefly by two marks — Catholicity and Unity. "Therefore the Church is one, whose holiness is gathered from her sacraments, and not measured by the pride of persons. This one Church cannot be identified with every one of the different heretical sects, nor with the schismatical bodies; she must then be that of the one or the other of these many communities. You, brother Parmenian, say that yours is the one Church of Christ. Therefore she is in this small country alone? And not with us? Not in Spain, in Gaul, in Italy, where you are not? Nor in all the other provinces and islands where you are not now, nor ever will be? Where, then, is the propriety in calling her Catholic, since she is termed Catholic precisely because she is consistent and spread all over the world? This was promised her in the Saviour to whom it was said: To thee will I give the Gentiles for an inheritance, and the ends of the earth for a possession." [11] Hence, the author concludes, any merely national church, such as at best the Donatist sect is, is by that very fact shown not to be the Church of Christ.

The first mark of the Church, therefore, is that of Catholicity; the second is Unity. Parmian, forced by the exigencies of the controversy, had named six other marks besides that of holiness; five of these Optatus admits, but he fixes on Unity as the most essential. The Church must be one, excluding both heresy and schism. It was to secure this that Christ made Peter the foundation of His Church. "We must inquire, therefore, where Peter established his *cathedra*. Now you cannot deny that you are perfectly aware of the fact that Peter established his episcopal chair in the city of Rome, where he sat as the head of all the Apostles. That thus unity might be observed by them all, and not each one stand up for his own, thereby becoming a schismatic and a sinner. In this one chair, therefore, which holds the first place in the Saviour's dowry to His Church, first Peter sat, who was succeeded by Linus, and Linus was succeeded by Clement . . . and Damasus

[11] Ibid. II, 28, 29.

was succeeded by Siricius, with whom to-day we are in communion, and with whom all the world through epistolary communication is associated in the unity of faith. Do you, who wish to claim the Holy Church for yourselves, now then show the origin of your *cathedra*." [12]

This is not only the mark of Unity, but of Apostolicity as well; for it is a unity that is based on the Primacy of the Bishop of Rome, in virtue of his succession to the place and the prerogatives of Peter, as all the world acknowledges. Hence whatever church is not in communion with Rome, is by that very fact proved to be not the Church of Christ. And of this the Donatists themselves are aware, for they have tried to establish a bishop at Rome; but this is a vain endeavor, as he does not have the *cathedra* whereon Peter sat. He is a son without a father, a disciple without a master.[13]

Then taking up the question of holiness, the author admits that the Church of Christ must indeed be holy; but this holiness does not exclude sinners from her fold. She is the field mentioned in the Gospel, wherein wheat and cockle grew together until the time of the harvest. Her holiness consists first and foremost in her sacraments, by which she sanctifies her children and receives back the erring. On the day of judgment, indeed, there shall be a separation of the good and the bad, but until then we must suffer them to grow up together. For it is unlawful that we bishops should do what the Apostles did not do, who gave no permission either to separate the seed or to tear up the cockle from among the wheat. The Blessed Peter fell by denying his Master, but he did penance and thereby merited to be, for the sake of unity, the sole recipient of the keys, the use of which he was also to communicate to others. If you, Donatists, will follow his example and be truly converted from your erring ways, why should the Catholic Church refuse to receive you back into her communion? [14]

This same line of thought was also followed by St. Augustine, who for many years, in letters and sermons and controversial treatises, labored strenuously and prudently to heal

[12] Ibid. II, 31, 32.
[13] Ibid. II, 32, 33.
[14] Ibid. VII, 2, 3, 19.

the terrible schism, until during the three days conference held at Carthage, in 411, he defended the Catholic cause with such learning and charity that he carried all before him. From that time forward the schism gradually declined, although it did not entirely disappear until about a century later.

Although Parmenian had been thoroughly refuted by Optatus, still the Donatists boasted that he had never been fully answered, and indeed could not be answered. Augustine wrote three books against him in 401, and about the same time he composed seven books on baptism, in which he shows that the Donatists' appeal to Cyprian in support of their schism is extremely foolish, as the saintly bishop of Carthage never dreamed of separating himself from the universal Church. Next he wrote three books against Petilian, another Donatist champion, and utterly demolished his arguments. And when Petilian's defense was taken up by Cresconius, Augustine answered him in four books. To these controversial works, he added a treatise on the Unity of the Church, addressed to Catholics, for the purpose of enabling them to answer the quibblings of their Donatist friends. Besides this, he also treated the points at issue in several letters to private individuals, of which those to Honoratus, Generosus, and Glorius Felix may be instanced.

His main contention in all these writings is that there can be no reason sufficiently grave to justify a local community in separating itself from the universal Church, and if this were nevertheless done, that separation alone would prove to evidence that such a community had broken with the Church of Christ. "What can be clearer," he asks, "than the promises of God uttered thousands of years ago, and accomplished before our own eyes, namely, that in the seed of Abraham, which is Christ, all nations should be blessed? And what more obscure than the presumption of those men who assert that Christianity has perished in the whole world, Africa alone excepted? And this presumption of theirs they call light!" [15] "The question between us is, where is the Church? Christ

[15] Ad Parmen. 2, 1.

says in all nations. And you, who are not in communion with all nations, how can you be His sheep? Where the Church is, there is His fold. Whoever, therefore, draw away men from this fold are but ravening wolves that slay the sheep, by separating them from the life of unity." [16] "Therefore, whoever draws away any one from the universal Church to any sect, is a murderer and a child of Satan." [17]

These promises contained in Holy Writ, that the Church of Christ should be universal, embracing all mankind, he insists upon again and again. And with this he connects the idea that the Church must be Apostolic. Thus writing to Generosus, he says: "Holding, therefore, by these promises, should an angel from heaven ask you to quit the Christianity of the whole world and pass over to the Donatists, let him be anathema. For if it is a question of episcopal succession, the surest way is to count from Peter himself, to whom, as representing the whole Church, the Lord said: 'On this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against her.'" To Peter succeeded Linus, to Linus Clement . . . to Siricius, Anastasius, who now occupies the same see. In this succession no Donatist occurs; but they have sent one from Africa, who governing a few Africans keeps up there the mountaineers." [18]

Thus the universal Church traces back her origin through the Apostles to Christ Himself, and she shall endure till the end of time. She is truly Apostolic and indefectible. Commenting on verse 17 of Psalm 44, "Instead of thy fathers, sons are born to thee," he says: "Nothing is more evident. Only fix your eyes on the temple of the King, because thus He speaks in respect of unity diffused over all the earth. . . . Instead of thy fathers, sons are born to thee. The Apostles brought thee forth: they were sent, they preached, they are the fathers. But could they remain always with us bodily? . . . Even to the present time? Even till the remote future? Was then the Church left deserted by their going hence? By no means. . . . Instead of thy fathers, sons are born to thee. What does this mean? The Apostles were sent as fathers,

[16] Ad Petil. 2, 78.
[17] Ibid. 2, 13.
[18] Epist. 53.

in place of the Apostles sons are born to thee, bishops are constituted. For the bishops of to-day, who are dispersed all through the world, whence were they born? The Church herself calls them fathers, she brought them forth, and she placed them in the chairs of the fathers. Do not therefore consider yourself deserted, because you see not Peter, because you see not Paul, because you see not those of whom you were born: of your own children has grown up for you a Paternity. . . . See the temple of the King, how widely extended it is! . . . This is the Catholic Church: her sons are constituted princes over all the earth; her sons have been put in the place of the fathers. Let those who are separated from her acknowledge this, let them return to the unity, let them be brought into the temple of the King. This temple is built everywhere, placed firmly on the foundation of the Prophets and the Apostles." [19]

This wide diffusion of the Church, of course, implies unity; without that she would not be Catholic. The sects may also be widely diffused, if one takes them altogether, but this does not make them Catholic; because they are not united into one body, each one differing from the other and flourishing in its own little place.[20] The Church is the spouse of Christ, and as such she is one. All her children are united by the bond of faith, and if any one teaches unsound doctrines, he is a heretic and must be avoided as an enemy.[21] They are all linked together by a mutual charity, avoiding schism. It is a unity prefigured by the Saviour's seamless coat.[22] And finally they are all in communion with the *cathedra* of Peter.[23]

And this Church is Holy, but with a holiness that does not exclude sinners. She is a "corpus permixtum," as Christ Himself pointed out in His parables of the wheat and tares and the draw-net with its good fish and bad. Her sanctity, therefore, does not primarily consist in the holiness of her individual members, but rather in her power and mission to sanctify all by teaching the truth and communicating God's

[19] Enar. in Ps. 44, 32.
[20] Serm. 46, 18.
[21] De Civit. Dei, 18, 51, 1.
[22] Serm. 265, 7.
[23] Serm. 259, 2, 2.

grace through the administration of her sacraments.[24] Yet there is in the Church a certain select body, holy souls, the "invisibilis caritatis compago," spiritually as distinct from her sinful members as Catholics are from heretics; but they do not form a church by themselves, as the Donatists affirm. The two classes constitute one Church of Christ, "propter temporalem commixtionem et communionem sacramentorum." [25]

In matters of faith, this "One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church" is an infallible guide. "She is the predestined pillar and groundwork of truth." [26] She stands like a solid rampart against all errors; heresies may indeed originate in the ranks of her children, but the gates of hell shall never prevail against her.[27] Such is the weight of her authority that whoso attacks her shall be dashed to pieces.[28] The source of this infallibility is the permanent assistance of Jesus Christ, who governs her through the Holy Spirit.[29] No heresy can drag her away from the path of truth; because Christ, her Head in heaven, guides and directs her as His own body.[30] If it were not for this indwelling and guidance of the Lord, she too, like the sects, would lapse into error.[31] But now she is the supreme authority in matters of faith, and also the legitimate and unerring interpreter of Holy Scripture and tradition.[32] Refusal to acknowledge her as such is either the height of impiety or stupid arrogance.[33]

The Primacy over the universal Church is held by the Bishop of Rome. That this was really Augustine's view cannot be doubted, although Protestants are usually at great pains to controvert the fact. "Peter," he says, "received the Primacy over the other disciples"; [34] "to him the Lord, after His resurrection, confided the feeding of His flock"; [35] and it is the Roman Church "in which the Primacy of the Apostolic

[24] De Utilitate Credendi, 35.
[25] De Doctr. Christ. 3, 45.
[26] In Ps. 103, 17.
[27] De Symb. ad Catech. Serm. 1, 14.
[28] Serm. 294, 18.
[29] Enar. in Ps. 56, 1.
[30] De Nupt. et Concup. 1, 20, 22.
[31] Enar. in Ps. 9, 12.
[32] De Doctr. Christ. 3, 27, 38.
[33] De Until. Cred. 17, 35.
[34] Enar. in Ps. 108, 1.
[35] Contr. Epist. Fund. 6.

cathedra has ever maintained its vigor." [36] It was because of his firm belief in the Primacy of Rome that Augustine so readily allowed appeals from his own judgment to that of the Pope,[37] and that he was so careful to have the decisions of African synods approved by Papal rescripts.

Nor can there be any reasonable doubt that he also took the next step, and ascribed to the Pope the prerogative of infallibility in matters appertaining to faith and morals. That the universal Church, as gathered in an ecumenical council, "plenario totius orbis concilio," is divinely preserved from teaching error, he states in so many words.[38] He also states that particular synods, whether merely provincial or national, as "plenarium totius Africæ concilium," can justly claim the right to close all further discussion; [39] not, however, by any inherent authority of their own, but in so far as their decisions are accepted and confirmed by the Pope.[40] That this statement implies belief in Papal infallibility is obvious. For it is the Pope's confirmation that makes the decisions of these particular synods irreformable. Hence in his discussion with Julius of Eclanum, Augustine reproaches him severely with not having listened to Pope Innocent, whose decisions could not corrupt the ancient doctrine of the Church.[41] Furthermore, in matters of faith, he says, it is the duty of all to have recourse to the Apostolic See and its pastoral ministry; for God specially directs the Pope in giving his decisions.[42] It is true, the oft quoted phrase: "Roma locuta est, causa finita est," is not found verbally in any writings of Augustine; but its equivalents occur again and again. And this is all that can be required to make him a staunch supporter of Papal infallibility.

In connection with this it may be of interest to note the reasons which St. Augustine assigned for his remaining in the universal or Catholic Church. Writing against the Funda-

[36] Ep. 43, 7.
[37] Ep. 209.
[38] Serm. 294, 21, 20; De Bapt. 1, 7, 9.
[39] Serm. 131, 10.
[40] Ibid.; Cont. Duas Ep. Pel. 3, 3, 5.
[41] Cont. Jul. 1, 4, 13.
[42] Ep. 176, 2.

mental Epistle of Mani, he says: "You ask, what retains me in the Catholic Church? Without pretending to that profound wisdom and knowledge which falls to the lot of a few, and whose existence in the Catholic Church you deny, I say with the simple faithful, that many other things retain me: the consent of peoples and nations; authority founded in miracles, nourished by hope, perfected by charity, confirmed by antiquity; the succession of bishops from the Apostle Peter to him who now occupies his see; in fine the very name Catholic, which the Church has always retained, so that if in any country you ask for the Catholic Church, not even one of the sectaries will point to his conventicle. These bonds suffice to retain me in the Catholic Church, even though my dulness of understanding or imperfect life should deprive me of deeper knowledge." [43]

These expositions of Augustine and Optatus brought the traditional teaching on the Church and her powers to a point where it practically remained during the Patristic age. Later Popes continue to urge, as their predecessors did before them, that in matters of faith and universal discipline the final decision rests with them; bishops and particular councils as a general rule admit the validity of this claim, and so likewise do several general councils; individual theologians here and there emphasize one point or another in reference to the constitution of the Church, her divine mission to teach and save all men, and her title to the obedience of high and low in all matters appertaining to the life of faith: but in all this no appreciable advance is made over what was firmly established and clearly understood by the end of the Donatist controversy. Only after the birth of Scholasticism was the work of development along these lines taken up again, to be finally completed in the definitions of the Vatican Council.

[43] C. 4, n. 5.

CHAPTER XXII

SACRAMENTAL THEOLOGY[1]

The second contention of the Donatists, as indicated above, touched the validity of the sacraments when conferred outside their own sect. Not only did they rebaptize those who came to them from any other communion, but they laid it down as a fundamental principle that no one could administer any sacrament validly, or offer the Holy Sacrifice, except he were a member of the true Church of Christ, which, of course, they identified with their own. In some respects this was a logical deduction from the position taken by St. Cyprian and his friends in the time of Pope Stephen. For they, too, made the sacraments and the Holy Spirit so exclusively the possession of the Church that outside her communion neither the one nor the other could be validly conferred in the present economy of salvation. They were, however, charitable enough, though somewhat inconsistently, as to admit that those who differed from them in this particular view might still belong to the Church of Christ. The Donatists had more logic, but less charity.

It was whilst attacking this assumption of the Donatists that Optatus and Augustine found occasion to develop somewhat the traditional teaching of the Church on the nature of the sacraments and the conditions that were regarded as essential for their valid administration. In this, again, the way had been prepared for them by their predecessors during the previous centuries, and to some extent also by their contemporaries independently of the controversy. Whilst it is true that no formal theory had as yet been worked out which would enable them to construct an essential definition applicable to

[1] Cfr. Pourrat, Theology of the Sacraments; Tixeront, H. D. II, 160–191; 305–424.

all the sacraments, nevertheless the fundamental elements of such a theory were well known, and more or less successfully applied to the three sacraments of Christian initiation, baptism, confirmation, and the Holy Eucharist. These elements are found in sacramental symbolism, which dates back to the days of St. Paul. When he compared baptism to Christ's burial and resurrection, and matrimony to the union of Christ with His Church, he laid down principles which were in course of time gradually extended to similar religious rites. In its material sense baptism is a cleansing of the body, but this material cleansing of the body symbolizes the spiritual cleansing of the soul; it represents and in some way effects the recipient's dying to sin and his rising to a new life, the life of grace. From this symbolism to the theory of efficacious signs of grace there is only one step, and this step being taken, the first part of sacramental theology is complete. Augustine took this step, and thereby completed the work of those who had gone before him.

The better to appreciate the great work thus accomplished by the bishop of Hippo, it will be helpful to review briefly what had already been done in the same field of theological inquiry both in the East and the West. A mere outline will be sufficient for our purpose.

In the East sacramental symbolism received its first scientific development through the labors of the Alexandrians, especially Clement and Origen. Baptism is to them a burial and resurrection with Christ, as St. Paul had expressed it, and as such it is a sign or symbol of what takes place in the soul. The neophyte on being submerged in the baptismal water dies to sin, and emerging thence rises to the life of grace. This is not effected by the water as such, nor by any magic charm, but by the power of the Holy Trinity under whose invocation baptism is conferred. What God could do by a mere act of His will, that He effects through the external rite. This symbolism falls in with Origen's definition of a "sign," which is "a visible something that suggests the idea of another invisible thing." [2]

[2] In Ep. ad Rom. 4, 2; cfr. In Joan. 6, 17.

The Holy Eucharist, too, whilst really containing the body and blood of the Saviour, is a symbol of the spiritual effects which it produces in the soul. In this respect it may be compared to the teaching of Christ, which "nourishes our souls and gladdens our hearts." Bread and wine are bodily nourishment, but when they have been sanctified by the prayer of consecration they become spiritual food for those who partake thereof in the spirit of faith.[3] "This is the suitable food which the Lord gives us, and henceforth nothing is wanting for His children's growth."[4]

For a while the application of this symbolism to the Eucharist met with considerable opposition, owing to the ambiguity to which it gave rise in reference to the Real Presence. Ignatius of Antioch had already spoken of the Eucharist as the symbol of charity and of union in faith, but Origen's allegorizing tendencies caused not a little suspicion in regard to this matter. Hence Theodore of Mopsuestia thought himself called upon to enter a vigorous protest. "Christ," he writes, "did not say, 'This is a symbol of my body, and this is a symbol of my blood,' but He did say, 'This is my body and this is my blood.' He teaches us to draw away our minds from the nature of the offering, and to consider only that these gifts are transformed into His flesh and blood by the Eucharistic prayer."[5] Others were more or less of the same mind, until the doctrine of transubstantiation became more clearly understood. Then all ambiguity ceased and Origen's exposition was readily adopted. Thereafter the appearance of bread and the appearance of wine, as St. Cyril of Jerusalem expressed it, were commonly regarded as figures of the body and blood of Christ, as symbols containing the divine reality which is given us as the spiritual nourishment of our souls.[6]

The same symbolism was also extended by these writers to confirmation, which was then conferred immediately after baptism, forming a part of the same ceremony. Christ in His baptism was anointed with the Holy Spirit, and the newly

[3] Orig. In Ep. ad Rom. 4, 2; In Matt. 9, 14; 11, 4.
[4] Clem. Paed. 1, 6, 42, 3.
[5] In Matt. 26, 26.
[6] Mystag. 4, 3, 9.

baptized Christian is anointed with chrism in order that he may share in the same divine gift. Of itself the chrism has indeed no power to effect this, but its efficacy is derived from the Holy Spirit Himself who is invoked by the bishop. As the oil flows visibly over the body, the soul is invisibly sanctified by the life-giving Spirit of God.[7]

All this, it is pointed out, is conformable to man's nature: for being made up of a material body and a spiritual soul, he apprehends and understands the spiritual action of God in the interior of his soul more readily when it is represented to his bodily senses in a material form. "If thou hadst been incorporeal," writes St. Chrysostom, "Christ would have given thee purely incorporeal gifts, but because the soul is united to a body, He delivered to thee what is intelligible to the mind in things that are perceptible to the senses." [8]

Along with this almost perfectly developed sacramental symbolism, which St. Augustine defined more accurately in his controversy with the Donatists, these Eastern writers also brought out a number of other points that were destined to receive a clearer exposition in the same controversy. One of them is the impression of a special mark or character on the soul, as an effect of baptism, confirmation, and orders. Even the writers of the sub-Apostolic age spoke quite generally of baptism as a sphragis or seal, which the Christian must ever keep inviolate. They, however, did not enter into any particulars, so that it is not clear what precisely they understood by this term. But as used by the fourth-century theologians the meaning of the term is no longer doubtful. Thus Chrysostom says that the Jews of old, like a flock of sheep, were marked with circumcision, whereas Christians are stamped with the Spirit, as it behooves the children of God.[9] Whilst baptism is being administered, the Holy Ghost marks the souls with His own seal.[10] This seal is spiritual in its nature, it is beneficial to the recipient, it is indestructible. It marks the soul as God's own property, and protects it against the attacks of the demons. It is the distinctive mark of the Christian,

[7] Ibid. 3, 1, 2, 3.
[8] In Matt. Hom. 82, 2, 4.
[9] In Ephes. Hom. 2, 2.
[10] Cyril, Catech. 4, 16.

whereby he is known as belonging to the family of Christ, and entitled to the protection of God's angels.[11]

A similar mark is produced by confirmation. "Whilst the chrism flows on the forehead of the neophyte," says St. Cyril, "the seal of the communication of the Holy Spirit is produced in him." [12] Hence in the formula then used for the blessing of the chrism, the bishop prayed that all those who were about to receive the unction might become partakers of the Holy Ghost, and, confirmed by His seal, might remain immovable and strong in the faith.[13] Hence, too, the sacramental formula of confirmation in use among the Greeks, which dates back to the fourth century, consists of the words: The seal of the gift of the Holy Spirit.[14]

When speaking about the character impressed by the sacrament of orders, these authors are not quite so clear. Yet the newly ordained are referred to as separated from the rest of the faithful, deputed in a special manner to do the work of Christ. They receive a permanent consecration, somewhat resembling that of altars on which the divine mysteries are celebrated. This is especially brought out by Gregory of Nyssa, who points to the fact that through the power of God an invisble transformation takes place in those who are ordained, whereby they are enabled to do what lay beyond the power of Moses and the Prophets to effect.[15] There is a certain vagueness about all this, but the fundamental idea of the sacramental character is undoubtedly there.

Another point is that the efficacy of the sacraments is independent of the moral disposition of the minister. The sacraments belong to Christ, and the minister cannot frustrate their effects, unless indeed he corrupts the sacramental rite itself. This latter, according to Athansius, was done by the Arians and some other heretics who denied the Trinity, and therefore, it was assumed, they could not rightly perform the religious rite of which the invocation of the Blessed Trinity formed an essential part. The same view is taken by Basil and Cyril

[11] Id. Protocatech. 17; Catech. 1, 3.
[12] Catech. Mystag. 4, 7.
[13] Euchol. Serap. 25, 2.
[14] Cyril, Catech. 18, 33.
[15] In Bapt. Christi, P. G. 46, 581.

of Jerusalem, and hence they rebaptized converts that came to them from these sects, although they never called in question the validity of sacraments conferred by schismatics. The one who expressed himself most clearly on this matter was St. Chrysostom, who directed attention to the fact that in the administration of the sacraments priests and bishops are merely the instruments of the Saviour. "The gifts which God bestows," he says, "are not such as to be the effects of the virtue of the priest; all is the work of grace. His part is but to open his mouth, while God works all: the priest effects only the symbolical sign." [16] "When the priest baptizes, it is really not he who confers baptism, but it is God whose invisible power bestows the grace of regeneration." [17]

Similar views concerning these various points prevailed in the West before the matter was brought to an issue in the Donatist controversy. Sacramental symbolism was already adverted to by Tertullian, although his extremely realistic views did on the whole not favor the development of the theory. Baptismal immersion is a bodily act, but it benefits the soul in a spiritual way; and the anointing with oil is a bodily act, but it spiritually benefits the soul. Cyprian uses almost the same language in regard to baptism, but is more explicit when he comes to speak of the Holy Eucharist. The many grains of wheat which form but one bread, and the mixture of wine and water blessed in one chalice, typify the union which is effected by the Eucharist between Christ and His people. The Saviour's body and blood are really present, and their reception in holy communion fosters the life of faith and charity of which the Eucharist is the symbol.[18]

These ideas were set forth in much greater detail by St. Ambrose. He distinguishes clearly between the external rite that falls under the perception of the senses and the interior effects that can be known by faith alone. Yet even these invisible effects are in a manner made tangible by the external rite. The immersion of the neophyte in the baptismal font typifies his death to sin; the unction of the newly baptized with

[16] Ep. II ad Tim. Hom. 2, 4.
[17] In Matt. 50, 3.
[18] Ep. 63, 17.

oil symbolizes the unction of his soul with the Holy Spirit; the appearances of bread and wine in the Holy Eucharist contain and signify the body and blood of the Saviour, which the faithful receive as the nourishment of their souls.[19]

As regards the sacramental character the Latin writers of this period are, as a general rule, not quite as explicit as their Eastern contemporaries. Tertullian had already represented baptism as a covenant between God and the Christian, which he conceived to be confirmed by a seal. If the Christian proves unfaithful to this covenant, the seal still remains.[20] This idea was taken up by subsequent writers, and gradually also extended to confirmation and orders. After baptism, says St. Cyprian, neophytes receive the Holy Ghost by the imposition of the bishop's hands, that thus their initiation may be perfected by the *signaculum* of the Lord.[21] This is somewhat further developed by St. Ambrose, who says that our souls are marked by the Holy Spirit with a spiritual sign, so that we may preserve undimmed the brightness of His image and the grace which He has bestowed. "And this indeed is a spiritual seal."[22] In its fundamental concepts this teaching is obviously identical with that of the Eastern writers, but it is less developed as regards details.

About the other point above referred to, the independence of sacramental efficacy in respect to the moral disposition of the minister, there was in the beginning of this period some disagreement, as is evident from the baptismal controversy. When Cyprian asserted that no one not in communion with the Church could administer the sacraments validly, he supposed not only that the sacraments belonged exclusively to the Church, but also that the bestowal of the Holy Spirit through the sacramental rite was dependent on the sanctity of the minister. "But who," he asks, "can give what he himself does not have, or how can any one who has lost the Holy Spirit perform these spiritual rites?"[23] Hence in his view, and

[19] De Spir. Sanct. 1, 83, 77; 1, 76; De Myst. 50, 52, 54.
[20] De Spect. 24.
[21] Ep. 73, 9.
[22] De Spir. Sanct. 1, 6.
[23] Ep. 70.

that of his followers as well, the efficacy of the sacraments depends at least partly on the disposition of the minister.

Pope Stephen at the time took the opposite view, which, he contended, was handed down by the Apostles. "Whoever has been baptized in the name of Christ receives forthwith the grace of Christ." Although this is a rather sweeping statement, yet, presupposing the proper disposition of the recipient, it is perfectly true, and, at all events, it firmly established the principle that the efficacy of the sacraments is independent of the minister's faith and sanctity. This was still further developed by the unknown author of the treatise entitled *De Rebaptismate,* who wrote about the same time. He clearly distinguishes between the validity of the sacramental rite and its spiritual fruitfulness. The former may be had without the latter, and therefore when heretical and unworthy ministers confer the sacraments, the sacramental rite is valid, but the spiritual effects are not produced in the recipient until he is reconciled to the Church.[24] This latter distinction was more or less lost sight of by subsequent writers until the time of St. Augustine, but in some way all assumed that the minister's unworthiness did not interfere with the effects of the sacraments, if nothing else intervened to invalidate the sacramental rite.

These, then, were the general views entertained at the time when the Donatist controversy brought the subject of sacramental efficacy into the foreground of theological discussion. Obviously the ground was well prepared, and in many instances Augustine needed do no more than explain in detail what his predecessors had already accepted as the common teaching. This, however, did not prevent him from clarifying certain obscure concepts and emphasizing a number of points that had been more or less overlooked before the controversy was started. It was chiefly in this that his labors were so fruitful.

In this connection but little need be said of the work of Optatus. He indeed valiantly defended the Catholic position against the Donatists, but in doing so he rarely went beyond

[24] De Rebapt. 2, 3, 4, 6, 11, 15; cfr. Conc. Arelat. 314.

what was clearly contained in the common teaching at the time. When the Donatists brought forward their chief difficulty, "Qui non habet quod det, quomodo dat?" if a person do not have what he may give, how does he give? he explained that in baptism, about which the difficulty chiefly turned, three things are to be considered: First, the Trinitarian formula; secondly, the recipient of the sacrament; thirdly, the minister. The invocation of the Trinity is absolutely necessary: the faith of the person who receives the sacrament is also necessary; but the proper disposition of the minister is necessary only in a secondary way. The first two enter in some manner into the sacrament itself, and are therefore unchangeable; the third is extrinsic to the sacrament, and in consequence is not absolutely necessary.[25] And the ultimate reason is this, that the minister is merely an instrument of Christ, who Himself is the chief minister of baptism. It is God who cleanses through the sacrament, and not man. It is He who gives, and it is His what is given. The recipient, indeed, must have faith; for it is because of this faith that God bestows His gifts: but the minister's faith does not determine the action of God. Let therefore the Donatists allow God to do His own work. For it is not man who bestows things divine. It has been promised to our times that Christ Himself would give what is given to-day. He indeed baptized, but by the hands of His Apostles, to whom He had given the law of baptism. In this matter we are all His disciples, so that we act in such wise that he Himself gives what He promised He would give.[26]

These points were sufficient to refute the main contention of the Donatists, and with this Optatus was satisfied. Hence it was left to Augustine, who took up the work begun by Optatus, to develop the Church's traditional teaching on the sacraments as the ever changing phases of the controversy required. This he did on many different occasions, now explaining and emphasizing one point of Catholic teaching now another, but for clearness' sake his scattered remarks may be reduced to a connected system of doctrine, of which the following is a brief outline:

[25] Cont. Parmen. VII, 4.

[26] Ibid. V, 4; V, 6, 7.

By way of general definition he states that sacraments are external signs of a sacred reality: "When signs appertain to things divine, they are called sacraments."[27] This, of course, is a very wide definition, and is readily applied to all sacred rites. Of this the author is perfectly aware and he frequently applies the term to the various ceremonies accompanying baptism and to other religious observances.[28] But a sign may either simply indicate a spiritual reality, or it may also concur in its production; when this latter is the case we have a sacrament in the strict sense of the word. In this restricted sense the term is applied by the author especially to baptism, confirmation, and the Holy Eucharist; and incidentally also to holy orders.[29] Matrimony he likewise calls a sacrament, but whether in precisely the same sense is not so clear.[30]

In every sacrament there are two elements to be considered: one that is sensible and signifies, the other that is spiritual and is signified. "They are called sacraments for this reason, that one thing is seen in them and another is understood."[31] The sensible element is itself made up of different parts, usually the *elementum* and the *verbum*. Thus in baptism the water is the *elementum*, the consecratory prayer and the invocation of the Trinity is the *verbum*. The two together make up the sacrament as distinguished from the effects which it produces. "Accedit verbum ad elementum et fit sacramentum, etiam ipsum tamquam visible verbum."[32] But "the sacrament is one thing and the power (or the effect) of the sacrament is another";[33] the two are quite distinct. Hence by the sacrament the author understands the whole external rite, and by the power of the sacrament the effects produced in the soul.

The bond between the sacrament and its effects is in some way indicated by the nature of the sacramental sign, so that, although Christ has assigned a spiritual meaning to these external rites, they are also of their very nature adapted to con-

[27] Ep. 138, 7.
[28] De Catech. Rud. 50.
[29] De Bapt. 5, 28; Cont. Faust. 19, 19; De Bono Conj. 32.
[30] Ibid. 32.
[31] In Joan. Tract. 80, 3; 26, 11.
[32] In Joan. Tract. 2, 4.
[33] Ibid. 26, 11.

vey this meaning. "For if the sacraments did not have some likeness to the things of which they are sacraments, they would not be sacraments at all." [34] Hence they are at the same time both natural and conventional signs. Of course, their power to produce the spiritual effect in the soul is not owing to the material element in itself; that comes from the consecratory prayer and from the sacramental form. "Whence does the water have such power that it should touch the body and cleanse the heart, if not because of the word?" [35] It is the power of Christ Himself acting through the consecrated water.

Hence the sacraments have Christ for their author, since the efficacy of the external rite is derived from Him. Augustine asserts this explicitly only of baptism and the Holy Eucharist, but his concept of sacramental efficacy makes it evident that he means to extend it to all true sacraments. And this he also indicates with sufficient clearness; for when he says of baptism and the Holy Eucharist that they flowed from the side of Christ, he immediately adds, "et si quid aliud in Scripturis canonicis commendatur." [36] Their power to sanctify is derived from the merits of Christ, and these merits He applies to His followers according to His own wise disposition.

The Old Law also had its sacraments, among which circumcision held the same relative place as baptism does in the New Law; but their chief purpose was to announce the future coming of Christ, whereas the sacraments of the New Law bestow upon the recipient the fruits of the redemption and bind the followers of the Saviour closely together in a religious community. Hence they are "virtute majora, utilitate meliora, actu faciliora, numero pauciora." [37]

In the administration of the sacraments the author clearly distinguishes the validity of the sacramental rite from its fruitful reception. When a person is baptized in heresy he receives the sacrament validly, but on account of a supposed want of proper disposition he is not thereby sanctified. "For it is

[34] Serm. 98, 9.
[35] In Joan. tract. 80, 3.
[36] Ep. 54, 1.
[37] Cont. Faust. 19, 13.

one thing to have the sacrament, and another to have it usefully," that is, to receive its proper effects.[38] It was for want of this distinction, he says, that Cyprian fell into error concerning rebaptism: "Non distinguebatur sacramentum ab effectu vel usu sacramenti." [39]

If the sacraments are conferred in the Catholic Church, although by an unworthy minister, they are not only valid, but also produce their intended effect. And the reason is that man's action in this matter is purely ministerial: "Non eorum meritis a quibus ministratur, nec eorum quibus ministratur, baptismus constat, sed propria sanctitate atque veritate propter eum a quo institutus est, bene utentibus ad salutem." [40] It is their own sanctity and truth, derived from the Saviour who instituted them, that makes the sacraments a source of salvation to those who receive them worthily. Hence they produce their effect *ex opere operato;* for although, according to the author, it is Christ who sanctifies the recipient, nevertheless He does so through the sacramental rite. "Propria sanctitate atque veritate propter eum a quo institutus est (baptismus), bene utentibus ad salutem."

And as the sacraments do not depend for their salutary effects on the moral disposition of the minister, so neither do they depend on the merits of the recipient; but in this latter they presuppose certain dispositions as a *conditio sine qua non* of their fruitful reception. What these necessary dispositions are the author does not state in detail, but in adults they certainly include faith. For when pointing out that baptism is productive of grace in children as well as in adults, he reasons that in their case the absence of actual faith is no obstacle to the infusion of grace; hence the necessary inference is that in adults the want of faith would be an obstacle.[41] And what is true of baptism in this respect is also true of other sacraments. Then there is need of some kind of intention on the part of recipients who have arrived at the age of reason; but on this point the author is rather liberal in his views, declining

[38] De Bapt. 7, 102.
[39] Ibid.
[40] Cont. Cresc. 4, 19.
[41] Ep. 98, 10.

even to hold as certainly invalid a baptism that is received "totus ludicre et mimice et joculariter."[42] In cases of emergency the intention of the subject may be presumed; for "multo satius est nolenti dare quam volenti negare."[43]

Three sacraments, namely, baptism, confirmation, and holy orders, imprint a character on the soul. This character is compared by the author to the image on imperial coins, to the *nota militaris* of soldiers, and to the brand wherewith sheep are marked. He conceives it to consist in a permanent consecration which cannot be lost, and therefore these sacraments cannot be repeated. Speaking of baptism and orders, he says: "Utrumque enim sacramentum est, et quadam consecratione homini datum; illud cum baptizatur, istud cum ordinatur; ideoque in Catholica Ecclesia utrumque non licet iterari."[44] And in another place he affirms the same of confirmation.[45] The soldier of Christ may become a deserter, but the badge of his enrollment always remains.

This brief outline of St. Augustine's teaching on the sacraments in general will be sufficient to indicate how much he contributed to the development of sacramental theology. He brought it to a point of perfection where it remained till the beginning of the thirteenth century. It was only then that his definition was perfected, and the causality of the sacraments more accurately determined. It is true, Augustine did not give expression to any definite view in regard to the exact number of sacraments, but neither was there any particular reason for investigating the subject carefully in his time. He mentions all the religious rites which we now regard as sacraments in the strict sense of the term, and also shows that he was acquainted with their salutary effects. Beyond this he had no occasion to go, as the controversy which called forth his exposition did not touch all the sacraments in particular. In our times, indeed, much emphasis is placed upon the fact that the sacraments are neither more nor less than seven; but that is owing to the denial of this truth by heretics. In Augus-

[42] De Bapt. 7, 102.
[43] De Conjug. Adult. 1, 33.
[44] Cont. Ep. Parmen. 2, 28.
[45] Cont. Litt. Petil. 2, 239; Serm. ad Pleb. Cæsar. 2.

tine's time the truth regarding this point was not called in question. Though sacramental terminology was still rather indefinite, nevertheless the seven religious rites which we now defend as true sacraments, were even then looked upon as in a class all by themselves; so much so that even those heretical sects which in the fifth century separated from the Church kept them all as belonging essentially to the religion of Christ.

By way of completing the foregoing summary, a few remarks must be made with regard to some of the sacraments in particular, as in reference to them there occur in the writings of the fourth-century Fathers several points that are of considerable importance. In this matter, however, no distinction need be made between Eastern and Western writers, nor between Augustine and his predecessors, as the points in question are treated by all of them in practically the same way.

1°. Baptism of water, although ordinarily necessary for salvation, may be supplied by martyrdom, and under certain conditions also by the baptism of desire. The former was universally admitted, but the latter was apparently denied by Chrysostom and Cyril of Jerusalem.[46] Baptism must be conferred in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; however, Basil and Ambrose seem to have held that baptism in the name of Jesus alone would be sufficient.[47] Grace is bestowed on little children as well as on adults.[48]

2°. Forgiveness can be obtained for all sins committed after baptism, but if they are grievous they must be confessed. Public penance, enjoined for the "crimina graviora," appears to have been conceded only once in a life-time.[49] Occasionally reconciliation was deferred till the hour of death. In some places the practice had crept in of denying final reconciliation to those who had put off doing penance, a practice that was severely condemned by Celestine I.[50] Ambrose, Pacian, Augustine, and Gregory of Nyssa made some attempt at classifying sins according to their gravity and in reference to the

[46] Chrysost. In Ep. ad Philipp. Hom. 3, 4; Cyril, Catech, 3, 4.
[47] Basil, De Spirit. Sancto, 28; Ambrose, De Spirit. Sancto, 1, 3, 42.
[48] August. Ep. 166, 7, 21.
[49] Ambrose, De Poenit. 2, 10, 95.
[50] Ep. 4; P. L. 50, 431.

necessity of confessing them, but they are not very clear on the point. The power of the keys was admitted by all, though hardly any of them go into particulars with regard to its use.[51]

3°. The real presence of Christ's body and blood in the Holy Eucharist is universally taught, and on occasions strongly emphasized. Some difficulty has been raised with regard to St. Augustine's view on this point, but his belief in the Real Presence cannot justly be called in question. He insists indeed strongly on the spiritual aspect of the Holy Eucharist, but he does so without rejecting the Church's traditional teaching on the Real Presence. Hence there are found in his works two series of texts, the one setting forth the common teaching that the Eucharist contains the real body and blood of the Saviour,[52] that the Eucharistic Lord must be adored before being received by the faithful,[53] and that the Real Presence is effected by the conversion of the bread and the wine into

[51] That the Church has the power to forgive sins, is thus neatly shown by Ambrose. Arguing against the Novatians, who excluded certain sins from the exercise of this power, he says: "Why do you baptize, if it be not lawful to obtain forgiveness through the ministry of man? In baptism assuredly forgiveness is obtained for all sins; but what is the difference whether priests exercise this power, which they claim was given them, through penance or through baptism? It is the same mystery in both" (De Poenit. 1, 8, 36). Again: "It is most evident that the Lord enjoined to extend the grace of this heavenly sacrament also to those who are guilty of the most heinous crimes, if they do penance for them from their whole heart and manifest them in confession" (Ibid. 2, 3, 19).

Augustine speaks in almost the same terms. Thus in one of his sermons he says: "If, then, after baptism anyone find himself entangled in his old sins, let him not be so far his own enemy as to hesitate to change his life, and, while he has yet time, to have recourse to the keys of the Church, by which he shall be loosed on earth that he may be loosed in heaven. Let him come to the prelates by whom the keys are administered in the Church, and receive from the ministers of the sacraments the due measure of satisfaction. And if his sin was not only an injury to himself but also a scandal to others, and such that the bishop should think it useful to the Church that he should do penance, not only before many, but even before all the people, let him not refuse nor add to his mortal wound the tumor of pride. . . . The keys of the Church are surer than the hearts of princes: for by these keys, whatever is loosed on earth shall be loosed in heaven" (Serm. 351).

[52] Serm. 1, 10.

[53] Enar. in Ps. 98, 9.

the body and blood of Christ;[54] whilst the other series, presupposing all this, points out that the eating of Christ's body and the drinking of His blood consist in sharing the Saviour's passion,[55] in being united with Him through faith,[56] and in becoming more intimately incorporated into His mystical body the Church, of which He is the Head.[57] Obviously, if we had only this latter series of texts we should look upon Augustine as teaching Eucharistic symbolism pure and simple; but if these same texts be read in the light thrown upon them by the former series, they are found to emphasize one aspect of the Eucharist without in any way denying the other. And hence it was that Augustine's disciples and admirers in the fifth and sixth centuries not only taught the Real Presence, but they did so without being in the least influenced by his supposed purely symbolistic conceptions. It was only during the early part of the Middle Ages, and again in the sixteenth century, that Augustine's authority was invoked by the opponents of the doctrine of the Real Presence.

The same authors who thus one and all teach the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the Holy Eucharist, also bring out with great distinctness the doctrine of Transubstantiation. It is true, the term itself is of later origin, but its significance is clearly contained in the works of these writers. Almost every possible expression is used by them to emphasize the change wrought by the Eucharistic prayer. The bread and wine are said to be *transformed, changed, converted,* so that the bread is no longer bread but the body of Christ, and the wine is no longer wine but the blood of the Saviour. "Once in Cana of Galilee," writes Cyril of Jerusalem, "Jesus changed water into wine, which is akin to blood; and we would not believe Him when He changes wine into blood?"[58] "Rightly do we believe," argues Gregory of Nyssa, "that the bread which is sanctified by the word of God is converted into the body of God the Word."[59] St. Ambrose, answering an objection brought forward against the Eucharistic change,

[54] De Trinit. 3, 4, 5.
[55] De Doctr. Christ. 3, 16.
[56] In Joan. 27, 5.
[57] Ibid. 15.
[58] Catech. 4, 1.
[59] Orat. Catech. 37.

points to the omnipotence of God as its all-sufficient cause. In the creation of the world and the beings contained therein, he says, " He spoke and they were made, He commanded and they were created: if then the word of Christ could make out of nothing the things that were not, how should it not be able to change the things that are into what they were not " before the same word was spoken?[60] And even Augustine calls attention to the fact that the conversion of the bread and wine, which is daily wrought on our altars, is a far greater miracle than any of those recorded in the Bible.[61] These authors do indeed not theorize about the intimate nature of the Eucharistic change, but they are quite certain of the fact.

Furthermore, they are all agreed that this change is wrought in virtue of the Eucharistic prayer; but on the further question, to what particular words of that prayer the change must be attributed, their agreement is apparently not so complete. Whilst the Western writers usually regard the words of institution as effecting the change, their Eastern contemporaries, with the exception of John Chrysostom, seem to look upon the *epiclesis,* or subsequent invocation of the Holy Spirit, as more or less essential. This is strongly brought out by Cyril of Jerusalem, when he writes: " After we have sanctified ourselves, we beseech the good God to send His Holy Spirit upon the elements that are offered, that He may make of the bread the body of Christ, and of the wine His blood; for whatever the Holy Spirit touches is thoroughly blessed and transformed." [62] In course of time, especially through the influence of John Damascene, the Eastern Church officially adopted this view; whereas the West always maintained the more common traditional teaching, and finally all discussion concerning the point at issue was closed by an authoritative declaration that the words of institution alone are essential.

All these writers also strongly emphasize the sacrificial character of the Holy Eucharist. In it is offered to God a living, spotless, unbloody, and perfect sacrifice, which is a commemoration and in some manner a continuation of the great sacrifice

[60] De Myst. 8; 9.
[61] De Trinit. 3, 4, 5.
[62] Catech. 4, 1.

of the Cross. It is offered both for the living and the dead.[63]

4°. Extreme unction is referred to in the *Euchologium of Serapion,* where a prayer is given for the consecration of the "oleum aegrotorum"; and Innocent I speaks of it as a "genus sacramenti," that is in common use among the faithful.[64] Similarly Augustine, who, in the *Speculum,* which he wrote to place before the faithful their ordinary duties, exhorts his people in the words of St. James, that "if anyone is sick among them they ought to bring in the priests of the Church, to pray over the sick, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord, etc."[65] In reference to this exhortation, his biographer, Posidius, tells us that "if Augustine happened to be called to the sick, for the purpose of praying to the Lord for them and imposing hands on them, he went without delay."[66]

5°. Holy orders were then as now divided into major and minor; that is, in so far as a sharp distinction was made between the higher and lower degrees of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. How the minor orders were conferred is nowhere stated in the writings of the fourth-century Fathers, but bishops, priests, and deacons were ordained by imposition of hands and an appropriate prayer. The superiority of bishops over priests and of priests over deacons was commonly admitted to be *de jure divino,* although Jerome states in one place that bishops are superior to ordinary priests "magis consuetudine quam dispositionis dominicae veritate."[67] But in this view he had no followers.

6°. Marriage was by all looked upon as a sacred rite: the nuptial blessing was given to the bride, except in the case of a widow. Several diriment impediments were recognized.[68] With the exception of Ambrosiaster, the Latin writers regard the marriage bond as indissoluble, even in the case of adultery;[69] but several of the Greeks, among them Gregory of

[63] Didym. De Trinit. 2, 7; Chrysost. In Ep. ad Hebr. 17, 3; Ambrose, In Ps. 38, 25; Jerome, Ep. 94, 2.

[64] Ep. ad Decent. 11.

[65] Op. cit. 27.

[66] C. 27.

[67] Ep. 146; In Ep. ad Tit. 2, 15.

[68] Basil, Ep. 199, 23, 42; 217, 78.

[69] Ambrose, In Luc. 8, 5, 2; Jerome, Ep. 55, 3; August. De Adult. Conj. 1, 9.

Nazianzus, Chrysostom, and Basil, make statements from which the contrary doctrine has been inferred.[70] However, as these authors in other places stand up strongly for the indissolubility of the marriage bond, it is more probable that in the statements referred to they simply bear witness to a custom introduced by the civil law.[71]

[70] Naz. Orat. 37, 8; Chrysost. In Ep. I ad Cor. Hom. 19, 3; Basil, Ep. 199, 9; 299, 21.

[71] Naz. Orat. 37, 6; Chrysost. De Libel. Repud. 1, 2; Basil, Reg. 73, 2.

CHAPTER XXIII

PELAGIANISM AND THE QUESTION OF ORIGINAL SIN[1]

Pelagius was a British monk, whom Augustine calls a "bonum et praedicandum virum," but whose renown was destined to be changed into notoriety. His first great mistake was that he insisted too much upon the invincible power of the human free will to resist evil. This led him by degrees into various errors concerning man's primitive condition, his present state, and the part which divine grace plays in the economy of salvation.

Sometime during the first years of the fifth century he came to Rome, and there he met a certain Rufinus, a Syrian priest, from whom he learned to deny original sin. One of his earliest disciples was Celestius, a young and ardent monk, who knew not the value of discretion in stating his own convictions. This brought them both into trouble. After a short stay in Rome, they went to Sicily, then to Africa, and thence Pelagius alone traveled to Palestine. When left to himself, Celestius began to preach his false doctrine openly, with the result that he was summoned before a council, and as he refused to recant he was excommunicated. After this, Augustine sent his friend Orosius into Palestine to look after Pelagius. This resulted into a summoning of the latter before a local synod, but as he was favored by Bishop John of Jerusalem he escaped condemnation. Again brought before a synod at Diospolis, he somewhat modified his statements concerning the point at issue and a second time escaped without censure.

A little later Pelagius gained a most distinguished disciple in Julian, bishop of Eclanum in Apulia. He was a skilled

[1] Cfr. Tixeront, H. D. II, 432–505; * Bethune-Baker, An Introduction to the Early History of Christian Doctrine; Toner, Dissertatio Historico–Theologica de Lapsu et Peccato Originali.

logician and voluminous writer, and, according to Augustine, became the "architect" of the whole Pelagian system. However the Catholic party was not idle. In 416 two synods were held, one at Carthage and the other at Mileve, at both of which the innovators were condemned. This condemnation was ratified by Innocent I in 417. Another condemnation was passed upon them by two subsequent synods held at Carthage, each of which was attended by more than two hundred bishops. After some misunderstanding on the part of Innocent's successor, Pope Zozimus, this condemnation was also ratified in the *Epistola Tractoria,* which all the bishops of Italy and Africa were required to subscribe. Eighteen of them refused, and they were deposed from their sees. Some twelve years later Julian tried to effect his reinstatement at the Council of Ephesus, but his condemnation by the Pope was confirmed.

The various errors of the Pelagian system may be reduced to the following points, which, however, did not follow one another chronologically in the same order.

1°. Adam was created mortal and subject to all the present miseries of life; this state was not the result of sin, but the primitive condition of nature.

2°. When Adam sinned he did harm to himself alone, and not to his posterity, except in so far as he gave them a bad example.

3°. Hence men are born now in the same condition in which Adam was created, nor do they in their birth contract any sin.

4°. Therefore children do not stand in need of baptism in order to be cleansed from any original stain, but only that they may enter into the kingdom of heaven, which is distinct from life eternal.

5°. Man's natural powers and his free will are sufficient to overcome all temptations, to avoid all sins, to observe all the commandments of God, and to gain eternal blessedness.

6°. God's graces are merely external helps, or if any of them are interior graces, they are nothing more than illuminations which are vouchsafed to make the practice of virtue easier.

7°. All these graces are bestowed by God not gratuitously, but according to man's natural merits.

Against these errors Augustine, at the request of Bishop Aurelius, first delivered a series of sermons on the existence of original sin and the necessity of divine grace. His next effort was to protect the many friends who consulted him. To Marcellinus he wrote a book *On the Demcrit and Remission of Sins,* and the *Baptism of Infants;* and another, *On the Spirit and the Letter,* in which he develops the difficult doctrine of grace and free will. In answer to a book written by Pelagius, he composed a treatise, *On Nature and Grace,* and against a work of Celestius he wrote a short tractate, *On the Perfection of Righteousness.* Then, at the request of Pope Boniface, he undertook the refutation of two documents circulated by Julian of Eclanum, in a work entitled, *Four Books to Boniface.* Against the same Julian he wrote two other books, *Contra Julianum,* and *Contra Julianum Opus Imperfectum.*

The main points discussed in these several works are, of course, original sin and the necessity of divine grace; but many other questions, in one way or another connected with them, come also up for consideration. Attention will be called to them in this and the following chapter. First, then, we shall consider the subject of original sin.

When Celestius, in 411, was urged by the synod of Carthage to retract his erroneous views, he refused to do so on the plea that the question of original sin was still a matter of speculation, that it was not a dogma of the faith, and that consequently he could not be charged with heresy. Even priests, he said, are not unanimous on the point. On the other hand, Augustine, a few years later, concluded a sermon preached at Carthage with these words: "Let them calumniate us if they please; but let them not calumniate Holy Church, that labors daily for the remission of original sin in infants. This is a fundamental doctrine. Should anyone err in something not yet defined by the Church, it may be tolerated; but he must not try to shake the foundation of the Church itself." [2] He also

[2] Serm. 294.

maintained that the Church's representative teachers were in full agreement on this matter. Hence a brief summary of the prevailing views on original sin, previous to the Pelagian discussion, is not only advisable but necessary. The following outline will be sufficient for our purpose.

Origen, as was pointed out in a previous chapter, most probably held the doctrine of original sin; but his peculiar view on the preëxistence of souls and their falling into sin before their union with the body leaves some room for doubt. After him Methodius of Olympus teaches the doctrine rather clearly. "When man," he says, "was deceived by the devil, he violated the commandment of God, and thenceforth sin, propagated by this contumacy, took up its abode in him. . . . For deprived of the divine gifts and utterly prostrated, we have become a prey to concupiscence, which the cunning serpent and shrewd prevaricator excited in us." Then citing Romans 7, 18, he continues: "By these words the Apostle designates the sin which had been brought upon us by the violation of the divine commandment through concupiscence; from this sin there arise in us sprouts and branches and voluptuous thoughts." [3] Didymus the Blind is also very clear. Speaking of the virginal conception of Christ, he says by way of explanation: "If the Saviour had assumed a body procreated by man, He would of course have been stained by the sin which all of Adam's descendants contract in their birth from him; for in that case He would have been subject to the same law as we are." [4] Athanasius explains that as we all die in Adam, so are we raised to new life in Christ. And this death in Adam does not refer solely to the death of the body, but to that of the soul as well. For "when Adam sinned," not only the effects of sin, but "sin itself was transmitted to us." [5] Basil calls attention to original sin when speaking about the necessity of fasting. He admonishes his hearers to fast and give the food thus saved to the needy, that thereby they may "pay for the primitive sin; for just as Adam, by eating unlawfully, trans-

[3] Epiphan. Adv. Haer. 64, 60.
[4] Adv. Manich. 8.
[5] De Incarn. 3, 4; Cont. Arian. 3, 33; 1, 51.

mitted the sin, so we do away with the effects of that perfidious food by relieving the hunger of the neighbor." [6]

On the other hand, Gregory of Nazianzus, although maintaining in one place that Adam's sin is ours also, teaches nevertheless that unbaptized children are without sin.[7] The same position is apparently taken by Chrysostom, though Augustine interprets him differently, and even quotes from his writings a text, now lost, in which he speaks of a "paternal bond written by Adam, the beginning of a debt which we have increased by our subsequent sins." [8] Gregory of Nyssa also, whilst speaking very clearly of Adam's fall, makes no mention whatever of the sin having been transmitted to us. It has been suggested that the apparent opposition of these writers to the more common teaching may be explained by assuming that they admitted indeed the transmission of a moral stain, but did not look upon it as a sin in the strict sense of the term; because they considered that sin, properly so called, must originate in a person's own free will. This assumption, which is far from being improbable, would solve the whole difficulty.

The teaching of the Latin writers of this period is much more satisfactory. They follow the fundamental views traditional in the West. Thus St. Cyprian, arguing that baptism should not be withheld from children, says that "they have not sinned except in so far as they contracted the stain of death by reason of their descent from Adam according to the flesh; and for this they can obtain pardon more easily, as it is not a sin which they themselves committed, but which they received from another." [9] Hilary states that "in the error of one Adam all mankind went astray." [10] "Before we are born," Ambrose affirms, "we are defiled by an hereditary stain." And again: "In Adam I fell, in Adam I was ejected from paradise, in Adam I died; how can the Saviour restore me to my former condition, unless He find me in Adam?" [11] Jerome speaks in a similar strain: "No one is without sin,

[6] Hom. De Auct. Mali, 7.
[7] Orat. 40, 23.
[8] Cont. Jul. 1, 21, 23, 26.
[9] Ep. 64.
[10] In Ps. 118, 3, 3.
[11] Apol. Dav. 1, 56; In Luc. 7, 234.

not even a child of one day. . . . For if the stars of heaven are not pure in the sight of God, how much less is a worm and rottenness, and those who are held fast in the bonds of sin committed by Adam." [12] Pacian of Barcelona declares that the "sin of Adam has justly passed over to his descendants, because they have been begotten of him." [13] Finally a contemporary writer, usually referred to as Ambrosiaster, not only anticipates Augustine's doctrine, but uses almost the same terms. Commenting on Romans 5, 12, he writes: "It is manifest, then, that in Adam all sinned *quasi in massa;* for as he himself was corrupted by sin, those of whom he became the ancestor were all born under sin. Because of him, therefore, we are all sinners, because from him we are all descended." [14]

Hence the plea of Celestius before the synod at Carthage, that there was no agreement on the question of original sin, had really no foundation in fact. With the possible exceptions mentioned above, the writers of that and the preceding century were fairly well agreed on two points: the existence of original sin and its connection with the fall of Adam. Its nature, the ultimate reason of its propagation, how it could in any sense be called voluntary so as to be a real sin, they did not investigate. This devolved to a great extent upon Augustine in course of the controversy that ensued, although even he did not clear up these points completely. As it would be too lengthy to follow him through the various phases of the discussion, it seems advisable to reduce his teaching to a connected system, which may be done without altering in any way his own exposition of the doctrine as contained in his writings.

In order to prove the existence of original sin, Augustine drew arguments from many different sources. The following are the most important:

1°. From Holy Scripture: (a) Ps. vi, 6. "What does David mean by saying that he was conceived in iniquity, if not that iniquity is contracted from Adam?" (b) Job xiv, 4. "It is because of the original stain that he says, not even an

[12] In Joan. 3, 5.
[13] De Bapt. P. L. 13, 1092.
[14] In Ep. ad Rom. 5, 12.

infant of one day is free from sin." (c) Thes. ii, 3. "We were all the children of wrath," because of original sin. (d) Rom. v, 12. "In whom all have sinned," that is, in Adam, therefore all are born in sin. (e) John iii, 5. "Unless anyone be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven"; hence everyone has contracted a sin that bars the way.

2°. From the teaching of the Fathers: Cyprian, Hilary, Ambrose, Ambrosiaster, Irenæus, Reticius of Autun, Olympius of Spain, Gregory of Nazianzus, Basil, Chrysostom, the fourteen bishops of the synod of Diospolis; these are cited as witnesses to the teaching of the Church. With them on his side, he tells Julian: "You are convicted of error from all the world over; the testimony of these holy men is brighter than the sun." [15]

3°. From Infant Baptism: "That baptism is an ablution, a cleansing; those who receive it are redeemed from the slavery of Satan, and share in the redemption of Jesus Christ, as is proved by the exorcisms and by the renunciation of Satan required of the sponsors in the name of these children"; therefore they were born in sin. "You say that because of the sins of another these little ones ought not to have perished. They are the sins of another, but the sins of their father: and for this reason, by the law of descent and propagation, they are also ours." [16]

4°. From the sufferings of little children: "They extend even to attacks from the demons. How can one account for them, except by reason of original sin? They are not chastisements for personal sins, nor are they intended to try the virtue of these little ones." [17]

5°. From the profound and universal misery of mankind in its present condition: disease, pain, poverty, vice, labor, accidents, misfortunes of all sorts, which are the permanent condition of our race. Would the good God have placed all mankind in such a wretched state, were it not on account of some primitive fault in which all have a share? [18]

[15] Cont. Jul. 1, 30.
[16] Ibid. 7, 11; Opus Imperf. I, 48.
[17] Cont. Jul. 6, 67.
[18] Opus Imperf. 1, 50, 54.

As to the nature of original sin not much can be said except that it is involved in great obscurity. "Nothing is better known than its existence, nothing is more difficult to understand than its nature." [19] However, it must in some way consist in concupiscence; primarily in the craving for bodily pleasures, and secondarily in a general tendency away from good: "since every one is turned away from what is divine and of permanent value to what is changeable and of uncertain issue." [20] "This concupiscence (especially sexual passion) is an evil with which every man is born"; therefore it must in some manner be connected with the primitive fault.[21]

However original sin does not consist in concupiscence as such, but rather in its guilt. It is because of Adam's sins that concupiscence is found in all his descendants, hence its presence under these conditions is imputed to them as a fault. When persons are baptized, and thereby freed from original sin, concupiscence indeed remains, but its guilt is taken away. Baptism removes the shaft, yet the wound remains.[22]

This guilt of concupiscence is in each individual a real sin, because it is in a certain sense a voluntary guilt. Not that it was caused by the personal will of those who are infected with it, but by reason of Adam's position in respect to his descendants. "That which in little children is called original sin, in spite of the fact that they are unable to use their free will, is not without reason termed voluntary, because, contracted by the sinful will of the first man, it has become in a manner hereditary." [23] It is our own sin through our descent from Adam. Though the sin of another, it is nevertheless by the law of descent and propagation also our own.

The fact of transmission is certain, but the manner is involved in great obscurity. However it seems plain that the instrumental cause of transmission is concupiscence: not actual, but habitual. It is on account of this habitual concupiscence that even of the holy and lawful wedlock of God's own children are born children of this world and not children of God.

[19] De Morib. Eccl. Cath. 1, 40.
[20] De Lib. Arbit. 1, 34.
[21] De Pec. Mer. et Rem. 1, 57.
[22] De Nupt. et Concup. 1, 28, 29; De Trin. 14, 23.
[23] Retract. 1, 13, 5.

Parents do not beget children by reason of their divine sonship, but by reason of the concupiscence that is in them.[24] Hence it was that Christ, in whom original sin had no part, chose to be born of a virgin. "For although Mary's own body had been conceived under the influence of concupiscence, nevertheless as she did not conceive her Son's body in the same way, she did not transmit concupiscence to Him." [25]

The fact, therefore, that concupiscence is the instrumental cause of the transmission of original sin must be admitted; but precisely how the transmission is thus effected, is more or less a matter of conjecture. There are two hypotheses that seem admissible, yet neither of them is without its difficulties. Either both body and soul are generated by the father in a vitiated condition, or the body alone is thus generated by him. In the former supposition everything is clear, except the generation of the soul. If this is repugnant, then the soul, created by God pure and innocent, is vitiated or stained in its union with the body, according to God's hidden justice.[26] Theoretically Augustine favored the view which held the creation of individual souls by God, but as that seemed to make the transmission of original sin unintelligible, he in practice preferred to say that they are derived "ex traduce seminis." The existence of original sin, he argued, is a matter of faith, the creation of individual souls is not; therefore I cling to the former, and, if need be, sacrifice the latter.[27]

The consequences of original sin are many and grievous. Besides the physical evils already mentioned, the author emphasizes especially the following:

1°. The loss of freedom in respect of moral good. Adam, before the fall, had the power of avoiding evil and of doing good; by the assistance of God's grace, the *auxilium sine quo non,* he could perform actions that were meritorious of a supernatural reward. This freedom and power, which the author calls *libertas,* was lost to Adam's descendants through

[24] De Nupt. et Concup. 1, 20, 21, 27.
[25] Serm. 151, 5; cfr. De Nupt. et Concup. 1, 27.
[26] Contr. Jul. 5, 7.
[27] Ibid. 5, 17.

original sin. Not that free will itself, or the *liberum arbitrium,* was lost: no, free will did not perish in the fall, but freedom did — that freedom which Adam had in paradise, and which enabled him to fulfill all justice.[28]

2°. Eternal damnation of unbaptized children who die before they come to the use of reason. Since, aside from purgatory, there is no intermediate place between heaven and hell, and since these children, owing to original sin of which they were not cleansed before death, cannot enter heaven, their portion must be with the damned in everlasting fire.[29] However, the positive pain which they there suffer is "omnium mitissima," the slightest of all pains found in that place of horrors.[30]

3°. Universal damnation, from which there is no redemption except through the gratuitously bestowed grace of God. "Things, therefore, were in this condition: all mankind, as one mass of damnation, lay prostrate in evil and groveled therein, rushing from evil to evil, and, sharing the fate of the angels who had sinned, bore the just punishment of its impious desertion." [31] Hence were it not for the free grace of God, adults as well as children would all be condemned to the eternal pains of hell. With this is connected Augustine's theory of predestination and reprobation, of which something will be said in the following chapter.

This is, in brief outline, St. Augustine's teaching on original sin. It takes account of many points never touched by his predecessors, yet it also involves some of them in almost impenetrable obscurity. His partial identification of original sin with concupiscence was destined to retard the further development of this doctrine for many centuries. Not a few dogmatic theologians have tried to interpret it as being in full accord with present day teaching, but there is little in the works of St. Augustine that suggests such an interpretation. At all events, it was never so interpreted until the time of St. Thomas, and then only to a limited extent. Yet all

[28] Contr. Duas Epist. Pelag. 1, 5.
[29] Opus Imperf. Contr. Jul. 3, 199.
[30] De Pecc. Mer. et Rem. 1, 21.
[31] Enchir. 27.

these imperfections and obscurities should not detract from the consideration due to Augustine's work. With the exception of St. Anselm, no one improved on his teaching until the middle of the thirteenth century. And even then progress was slow, because of the difficulty of the subject. He well said: "Nihil ad praedicandum notius, nihil ad intelligendum secretius."

CHAPTER XXIV

THE QUESTION OF GRACE: SEMI-PELAGIANISM

As already stated in the preceding chapter, Pelagianism grew out of the undue emphasis which its author placed upon the power of man's free will. Since the human will is free, he contended, man can do good or evil just as he chooses: hence if he is not perfect, as his Father in heaven also is perfect, the fault lies entirely with his free will. He failed to reach perfection, because he failed to will it.

It was to maintain this fundamental proposition that Pelagius and his followers denied the existence of original sin, and swept aside all supernatural gifts and graces as in any way necessary for the practice of perfect virtue. God suited man's strength to the burden He imposed; hence for the carrying of this burden man's nature suffices. What Adam received in the beginning from the hand of his Creator, that he later on transmitted to his descendants: neither more nor less, and therefore Adam was created in the same state in which human nature has ever been since his day. He was neither immortal nor endowed with any other prerogative surpassing the exigencies of his nature. By the right use of his free will he could merit his eternal salvation, and also such extra divine helps as would make the practice of virtue more easy. And precisely the same obtains in our case. We receive no graces that are such in the strict sense of the term — entirely gratuitous gifts which lie beyond the reach of natural merit. Furthermore, with the possible exception of interior illuminations, whatever so-called graces we do receive consist in purely external helps, such as instruction, example, encouragement.

This is really the essence of Pelagianism, which, together with the denial of original sin, was finally condemned by the

Council of Carthage, held in 418, and approved by Pope Zozimus in the same year. In a considerably modified form Pelagianism appeared a few years later in Southern Gaul, where men of undoubted learning and holiness considered Augustine's teaching on grace and predestination to restrict unduly the freedom of man's will. Their system of teaching is known as Semi-Pelagianism, which will be considered in the second part of this chapter.

A — The Question of Grace

In this matter there are evidently two points that call for separate consideration: First, man's primitive condition in respect of gratuitous gifts and graces; secondly, man's condition since the fall in reference to the same or similar gifts and graces. Both points had frequently been touched upon by Eastern and Western writers previous to the controversy, but they were very much clarified by the efforts of Augustine to defend the traditional teaching of the Church. It will be helpful if we first summarize the general views that were then prevalent, and thereafter briefly outline Augustine's system of thought in this matter. However, as the common teaching on man's primitive condition has already been reviewed in a previous chapter, under the heading, "Anthropology," that part may be omitted here; except that a short account of Augustine's own views on the subject is properly inserted in this place to round out his system.

As was pointed out in the chapter referred to in the preceding paragraph, all the writers of this period looked upon the grace of Christ as effecting in us a certain deification which makes us partakers of the divine nature, not indeed substantially, but through the indwelling of the Holy Spirit and a close moral union with the Godhead. This grace is first communicated to us in baptism. Of the effects produced by baptism, St. Chrysostom gives the following vivid description whilst speaking of the neophytes: "They are not only free but holy, not only holy but just, not only just but sons, not only sons but heirs, not only heirs but brothers of Christ, not only brothers of Christ but coheirs, not only coheirs but mem-

bers, not only members but temples, not only temples but also organs of the Spirit. See how many are the blessings bestowed in baptism, and yet some fancy that the heavenly grace consists only in the remission of sins; but we have enumerated ten glorious gifts. And for this reason we also baptize the little ones, although they are not stained by (personal?) sin, so that they may receive sanctity, justice, divine adoption, a title to inheritance, the brotherhood of Christ, and being accounted His members." [1]

Baptism, then, makes us fit for heaven; it bestows the grace of divine adoption and makes us coheirs of Christ. But the title to heaven, thus gratuitously bestowed, must be preserved; it must be made good by a life of practical faith and divine charity. For this we need the help of God; it is a work that lies beyond the reach of our own natural strength. It is true, free will remained after the fall, because it is an essential endowment of our nature; but unaided free will can do no more than enable us to perform naturally good works; it cannot reach up into the supernatural order.

This was fully recognized by the writers now under consideration. Salvation, says St. Basil, does not come from the power of man, but from the knowledge and grace of God.[2] Or as Gregory of Nazianzus words it: "Our salvation must come both from ourselves and from God." [3] Commenting on the words of St. Paul, "non est volentis neque currentis, sed miserentis Dei," he says: "Since there are some who pride themselves on the good they have done, ascribing all to themselves, nor referring anything to their Creator and the wisdom of their Maker from whom all has been received, Paul teaches that even for the desiring of what is good we stand in need of divine assistance; nay even the choosing of what is right is something divine and a gift that comes to us from God's goodness. For our salvation must come both from ourselves and from God. . . . Thus because to will is also from God, hence he very justly ascribes the whole to God. However much you may run, however much you may strive,

[1] Apud August. Contr. Jul. 1, 6, 21.
[2] De Spir. Sanct. 18, 55.
[3] Orat. 37, 13.

you have need of Him who is disposed to crown your efforts." [4]

Practically the same view is taken by Chrysostom, although he is frequently adduced as a strong advocate of the power of man's free will. "God," he says, "looks for occasions from us to show forth His great liberality. Therefore, lest through laziness we should deprive ourselves of His gifts, let us hasten and press forward to lay hold of the beginning and the way that leads to virtue, so that helped by assistance from on high we may also be able to reach the end. For it is indeed not possible for us to do any good as we ought, unless we be helped by divine grace." [5] It is true, this looks as if he placed the beginning of good works in our own hands, but it must be borne in mind that he was pleading for personal efforts, and thus naturally emphasized his hearers' own part in the work of their salvation. The same may be said of another statement, which, as it stands, has a decidedly Semi-Pelagian coloring. Placing before his hearers the example of Abraham, in order to urge them on to strenuous efforts in the practice of virtue, he says: "But perhaps some will say that he received abundant grace from God, and the God of all manifested in his regard a singular providence. This is so, and I confess it. But if he had not first done what in him lay, he would not have received what came to him from the Lord. Consider, therefore, not this alone, but, having due regard to each particular, learn how in all things he first gave proof of his own virtue, and thus merited the divine help." [6] Similar views are brought out again and again in the writings of Chrysostom, but with all this he unhesitatingly ascribes the chief part in our good works to the grace of God.[7]

Contemporary Latin writers speak in very much the same strain. They, too, are, without exception, very clear on the elevation of human nature through the grace of Christ,

[4] Ibid.
[5] In Gen. Hom. 25, 7.
[6] Ibid. 42, 1.
[7] Thus in Homily 69, on Matthew, n. 2: "We are called not because of merit, but by grace." Also in Homily 4, on the Epistle to the Ephesians, n. 2: "Not even the gift of faith is ours, but God's; it is not bestowed because of our works."

and also on the constant need there is of divine help to make salvation possible. "You see, then," writes Ambrose, "that the power of the Lord everywhere sustains human endeavor; so much so that without the Lord no one can build, without the Lord no one can guard, without the Lord no one can even begin anything." [8] "We must be assisted and directed by God's grace," affirms Hilary, "that we may keep His precepts and work out our salvation." [9] With this Jerome is in full agreement when he says: "It is for God to call us, and for us to believe." [10] Victorinus is even more explicit. Commenting on the words of the Apostle, "work out your salvation," he says: "But again, lest anyone should be remiss in giving thanks to God, on seeing that he himself works out his salvation, it is added: 'For it is God who worketh in you according to your good will, both to will and to accomplish.' Therefore work out your salvation," he says; "but this work itself is from God. For God worketh in you, and He brings it about that you may thus will. . . . Thus who worketh not as assisted by God, in the first place does not have the will to work; and furthermore, even if he had the will, he is not able to accomplish anything, because he has no good will." [11]

But here again, in nearly all these writers expressions are occasionally met with that have a Semi-Pelagian ring to them. Man must will, must desire, must reach out to the good work, then God in His goodness will bestow His grace. These men spoke at times unguardedly, because the danger of Pelagianism was not yet apparent.

In this condition, then, did Augustine find the doctrine on grace when he was called upon to refute the errors of Pelagius and his followers. He did not altogether revolutionize it, nor in any way change it; yet whilst keeping all that was then commonly accepted, he developed it to such an extent, that a grateful posterity has honored him with the title, *Doctor Gratiae*. The following outline of his teaching on the subject is all that can here be attempted.

As already stated above, a short account of his views on

[8] In Luc. 2, 84.
[9] In Ps. 118, 1, 12.
[10] In Is. 49, 4.
[11] In Epist. ad Philipp. 2, 12, 13.

man's primitive condition is properly given in this place, although the common teaching on that phase of the subject has been reviewed in a previous chapter. It will give some completeness to his system. Leaving aside some doubtful expressions in his earlier writings, his final view comes to this. Before their fall, Adam and Eve were dowered with many preternatural and supernatural gifts, which perfected them in soul and body, and made their existence in paradise one of supreme happiness. Their bodies, though mortal by nature, had been gifted with immortality by the generosity of their Creator. They were at one and the same time mortal and immortal: mortal in the sense that their natural constitution admitted of death; immortal in so far as owing to God's special providence death had no power over them — they were in a condition not to die.[12] This immortality implied immunity from suffering, disease, old age: theirs was a perpetual youth, a life free from all misery, which, after a definite duration here on earth, was to be perfected by the greater blessings of life eternal.[13] Their minds were endowed with a high degree of infused knowledge and wisdom, which fitted them for their exalted position of ancestors and instructors of the human race.[14] Furthermore, they were free from all concupiscence, so that the sensitive part of their nature was in perfect subjection to reason, and their reason was subject to God.[15] They were indeed free, and capable of choosing either good or evil; but theirs was a freedom with a decided inclination to good. They could sin and they did sin, yet before sin was committed they were free from all interior inclination to sin.[16]

The foundation of these gifts was the "gratia justitiae," or, as we now call it, sanctifying grace. Adam was "vestitus gratia," clothed with grace. It was the same grace in which we are renewed through the redemption of Christ. We receive "per gratiam justitiae" that divine likeness to God

[12] De Gen. ad Lit. 6, 25, 36.
[13] De Civit. Dei, 14, 26; De Gen. ad Lit. 8, 11.
[14] Opus Imperf. 5, 1.
[15] De Gen. ad Lit. 11, 1, 3.
[16] De Correpl. et Grat. 11, 29; Opus Imperf. 5, 61.

which Adam forfeited by his disobedience, and through Jesus we enter again into the possession of the "justia fidei," the justice of faith, of which we were deprived in Adam. This "gratia" made Adam a spiritual man in his inmost being.[17] This was Adam's natural state; not natural in the sense that it was due to his nature, but in so far as God constituted him therein as his actual and permanent condition. Hence the contention of some that Augustine considered the primitive condition of our first parents as the natural state of man, in which God must create him, is really without foundation. The most that can be said is that Augustine did not professedly consider the possibility of the state of pure nature, but simply looked at the matter historically as he found it delineated in Holy Scripture.

Besides these supernatural gifts with which our first parents were dowered as they came from the creative hand of God, they received also a special divine help without which they could not have worked out their salvation. This was an "auxilium sine quo non," or an actual grace necessary for the performance of good works and for final perseverance in God's friendship.[18] They had, in virtue of their elevation to the supernatural state, the intrinsic powers or faculties to perform salutary actions; yet these powers must be assisted in exerting their activity by the help of God, so that their intrinsic capability might be actuated and find issue in salutary acts. This help was different from the grace which we receive since the fall; for as through Adam's sin we were deprived of the very power to act meritoriously, in our case grace is not only a help without which we do not perform good works, but without which we cannot: it must supply the very power or faculty itself. Hence the author calls it an "auxilium quo," a help which gives the power to act supernaturally and also assists that power in its action. Strictly speaking, this "auxilium quo" includes both sanctifying and actual grace; but Augustine, in his controversy with the Pelagians, considers it chiefly under this latter aspect. His teaching on the subject may be reduced to the following points:

[17] De Gen. ad Lit. 6, 37, 38, 39. [18] De Grat. et Lib. Arbit. 33.

1°. In the matter of actual grace we must distinguish between exterior and interior graces. Exterior graces are of many different kinds, comprising instruction, exhortation, example, pious reading, or any occurrence that may lead us to thoughts of a better life. Interior graces are of two kinds: illuminations of the mind that teach us what to do, and motions of the will that lead us to act. "Let them read and understand," the author says in reference to the Pelagians, "let them behold and confess that not by the law alone and by teaching coming from without does God work in the hearts of men by His marvelous and ineffable power, but also in an interior and invisible manner; and this not only by revealing Himself to the mind, but likewise by properly disposing the will." [19]

2°. Interior graces are further divided into prevenient and concomitant, or preventing and assisting grace. The former precedes the good action and leads up to it; it comes to us from God without our own doing: the latter accompanies the good action, and with this we must coöperate. "That we may will, God gives to us without any action on our part; but when we will, and will in such wise as to do, He assists us: nevertheless without Him, either bringing it about that we will, or helping us when we will, we can do nothing in the way of (supernaturally) good works." [20]

3°. Interior graces that precede the good actions may be either merely sufficient or they may also be efficacious. In the former case the divine help enables us to act, yet the act does not follow. In itself the grace was a sufficient help, but we failed to correspond. "It is the grace of God that helps the wills of men; and when they are not helped by it, the reason is in themselves and not in God." [21] In this sense we too have an "auxilium sine quo non," which we may abuse as Adam did in paradise. We have the power to act, given us by the grace that is presented; we have also the necessary assistance to make this power effective: but we fail to do our part. Hence the grace is not efficacious; it is merely sufficient.

In his explanation of efficacious grace the author is some-

[19] De Grat. Christi et Pecc. Orig. 1, 25, 8, 9.

[20] De Grat. et Lib. Arbit. 33.

[21] De Pecc. Mer. et Rem. 2, 17.

times very obscure. He understands by it, of course, a grace that not only enables us to act, but under the influence of which we do act. In itself it is a "delectatio," a drawing on to perform the good work in question. This is sufficiently clear; but what is the influence of this "delectatio" upon the will? He speaks of it at times as if it were irresistible; and this is the sense in which Jansenists and many Protestants interpret his teaching on efficacious grace. From expressions like this: "Quod enim amplius nos delectat, secundum id operemur necesse est," [22] they infer that in Augustine's view efficacious grace is a divine help which takes away man's freedom of action, in the sense that its impulse is irresistible. The will may indeed coöperate with such a grace, it need not be merely passive; but it has no power to refuse its coöperation. In this sense men are not induced to act, but driven thereto.

This is, however, a false inference. For although Augustine strongly emphasized the power of divine grace, he ever did so without denying the freedom of the human will. A large number of texts might be adduced in support of this point. Thus he says: "Men are induced to act, and not driven in such a way that they themselves do not act at all." [23] "To assent to God's calling or to dissent from it, as I have said, is the part of our own will." [24] He treats this matter very thoroughly in his *De Diversis Quaestionibus, Ad Simplicianum;* and although that treatise was one of his first works, he refers to it again and again in his later years, as a book in which, "quantum Deus adjuvit, acriter disputavi contra inimicos gratiae Dei." [25] It contains, therefore, his consistent teaching on the nature of efficacious grace; and that teaching, as there set forth, places the efficacy of grace precisely in this, that the divine call is of such a nature as to move man's will to act freely.[26] Hence dogmatic theologians, after carefully examining all that has been written on the subject, unhesitatingly appeal to St. Augustine as an authority for the freedom of the human will under the action of divine grace. The

[22] Expos. Ep. ad Gal. 49.
[23] Serm. 156, 11, 11.
[24] De Spir. et Lit. 34, 60.
[25] Retract. 2, 37.
[26] Op. cit. 1, 2, 13.

"necessity," therefore, of which Augustine speaks as induced by the greater "delectatio," in so far as it affects the will, is simply a strong inclination to follow the appeal of divine grace; it is in no sense irresistible.

4°. Grace is absolutely necessary, not only for the perfecting of good works, but for their beginning as well; and also for the beginning of faith. "We cannot even will unless we be called: and when after being called we do will, our own will and endeavor are not sufficient to lead us whither we are called, unless God supplies the strength for the finishing of our course." [27] "Our sufficiency by which we begin to believe is from God." [28] Grace is, moreover, purely a gift of God's mercy. "For it will not be the grace of God in any way, unless it has been gratuitous in every way. Grace does not find the merits in existence, but causes them. For if grace be by merit, thou hast bought, not received gratis." [29] However, actions performed under the influence of grace are meritorious, both in respect of additional graces and eternal glory.[30] But final perseverance can be obtained only by prayer.[31]

Closely connected with this subject of grace, and in one sense forming a part of it, is the question of predestination. Did God by an act of His sovereign will decree from all eternity that certain definite persons should infallibly be saved, whatever may be said of the rest of mankind? And if so, was He directed in forming this decree by the foreknowledge of their fidelity to grace, or did He decree their salvation independently of this foreknowledge? In either case, predestination to glory necessarily implies predestination to efficacious graces, as without them salvation is never actually attained. On the other hand, predestination to grace does not necessarily imply predestination to glory, since grace may be sufficient without being efficacious.

Augustine's teaching on this subject is not as clear as might be desired; and according to many critics, he was not always

[27] Ibid. 2.
[28] De Praedest. SS. 8, 16.
[29] Serm. 169, 2; cfr. Retract. 1, 22.
[30] Ep. 194, 9; De Perfect. Justit. Hom. 17.
[31] Cont. Duas Epist. Pelag. 3, 23.

consistent in explaining his views. Up to 412, when he began his discussion with the Pelagians, he held that even after the fall God sincerely willed all men to be saved, although He foreknew that some, through failure of corresponding with His grace, would not actually attain salvation. Hence God did indeed predestinate some to glory, but only *post praevisa merita;* guided, therefore, by His foreknowledge of their fidelity to grace. On this point most critics are agreed. But it is contended that Augustine later on changed his mind, owing to the position taken by the Pelagians, who denied predestination altogether and held that salvation depended solely on man's free will. On the other hand, not a few of the more recent critics hold that Augustine was consistent throughout, and that he taught predestination *post praevisa merita* up to the end of his life.[32] A general outline of his thoughts on the subject may be given as follows:

1°. From all eternity God chose His elect and predestinated them to heaven: "And how could He choose those who as yet were not, except by predestinating them? Therefore predestinating He chose them."[33] This predestination on the part of God is always effective: "Of them no one perishes, because all are chosen. If any of them were to perish, God would be deceived; but no one of them perishes, because God is not deceived."[34]

2°. Predestination implies the following gifts and graces: First, a call to faith that is efficacious, or that actually leads to the embracing of the faith; secondly, justification by means of efficacious graces, so that persons thus predestinated may be "holy and immaculate in the sight of God"; thirdly, final perseverance, at least in the sense that moral faults are repaired at the hour of death; fourthly, actual bestowal of the crown of life.[35]

3°. To the predestination of the elect corresponds the reprobation of those who are lost; with this difference, however,

[32] Cfr. E. Portalié, Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique, 2398–2407; Tixeront, H. D. II, 491 sqq.

[33] De Praedest, SS. 35.

[34] De Correpț. et Grat. 14, 23, 24.

[35] De Praedest. SS. 37, 36; De Correpț. et Grat. 16, 21, 22.

that God does not induce the reprobate to commit sin as He leads the elect to practice virtue. God decrees eternal damnation as a just punishment of their sins, but does not decree the sins of which eternal damnation is a just punishment. It has been said that in Augustine's view reprobation is a preterition or omission in the decree of predestination, a sort of negative reprobation.[36] But this interpretation of the Holy Doctor's teaching cannot be sustained. It is true enough that because of original sin he regards all mankind as a "massa damnata," "massa peccati," "massa perditionis," from which God needed not have separated any one; but he also tells his readers, "you have received the power to stand at the right hand of God; that is, to be made the sons of God;" [37] "it is *now* in your power to choose which of the two (elect or reprobate) you wish to be; choose whilst there is time." [38] Hence he necessarily supposes that God gives to everyone sufficient grace to avoid reprobation. If, therefore, some do become reprobate, is not simply because God passed them by, but because they failed to correspond with the graces which the merciful God placed at their disposal.

B — Semi-Pelagianism

Augustine's teaching on the necessity of interior grace for the performance of salutary actions was adopted by the synod of Carthage and approved by the Pope. Also many of his particular views on grace, though passed over by the synod, were accepted by his contemporaries; but others were called in question and even severely criticised. Four years before his death, the reading of his 194th letter caused such a commotion in the monastery of Adrumetum in Byzacene, that he found it necessary to explain his position on the question of grace and free will. Thus originated the two treatises, *De Gratia et Libero Arbitrio* and *De Correptione et Gratia,* which were sent to the monks and seem to have restored peace to the community.

Much more serious trouble, however, was started a little

[36] Cfr. Tixeront, H. D. II, 500 sqq.

[37] In Ps. 120, 11.

[38] In Ps. 36, Serm. 1, 1.

later in Southern Gaul, where John Cassian, abbot of Saint Victor at Marseilles, stood out strongly for the rights and power of free will under the action of grace. A disciple of Chrysostom and deeply imbued with the theology of the East, he looked with suspicion at the absolute dominance of grace as apparently taught by Augustine. He, like other Eastern theologians, maintained indeed the necessity of grace; but at the same time strongly emphasized the freedom of the will. "If God does everything," he was fond of saying, "where is our merit? And if we can do nothing without grace, what becomes of our liberty?" He was a strong and outspoken opponent of Pelagianism, and vigorously defended the necessity of grace for all salutary actions; but whilst defending grace, he did not wish to see man's free will sacrificed, and that, he thought, had been done by the bishop of Hippo. His own views he brought out in his thirteenth conference, entitled, *De Protectione Dei,* which appeared sometime before 426, The following are his main contentions:

1°. A liberty that does not allow man to will and to do good "ex semetipso," by his own natural power, is not liberty in the true sense. As a fact, however, God in dispensing His graces sometimes demands and waits for our own efforts, and therefore the free will contributes something of its own.[39]

2°. God calls men in various and different ways; but of whatever kind God's calling may be, man can of himself resist or follow it; the beginning of faith is thus placed in his own power. Hence grace is an *auxilium sine quo non volumus,* and not an *auxilium quo volumus* as Augustine conceived it. Grace calls, solicits, inclines the will to act, but it does not give the very power to will and to begin the good work. We can of ourselves think of and desire the good; we can of ourselves follow the divine call, although without grace we cannot realize the good we conceive or perfect the salutary work we begin.[40]

3°. On the other hand, however, the grace of God is entirely gratuitous; the Pelagians are altogether in the wrong when they teach that men can of themselves merit grace; nay,

[39] De Protect. Dei. 12, 13. [40] Ibid. 14, 12, 13.

even between the good actions performed under the influence of grace and the final reward there is no strict proportion; the gratuitous mercy of God has its part in all.[41]

4°. As regards salvation, presupposing of course the help of God's grace, that depends finally on our own will. God intends the salvation of all men, and it is a horrible blasphemy to maintain the contrary. There is no such a thing as *predestinatio ante praevisa merita;* for grace is given indifferently to all and it is only the use or abuse of grace that is finally responsible for man's eternal salvation or damnation. In this sense, therefore, salvation depends on our own efforts. We can always correspond with the grace of God, which is given us, gratuitously indeed, but also infallibly. Even final perseverance is in our hands, since God's part in it is assured by the bestowal of the first grace.[42]

5°. If it be objected that grace is not given indifferently to all, because to some the Gospel is never preached, and others, as is the case with many infants, die before they have an opportunity of receiving baptism, the answer is that God was fully prepared to give them grace, but foreseeing the evil use these persons would make of it, He withheld it on account of their own demerits. Hence there is nothing arbitrary in the actions of God — there is no predestination and no reprobation except in consequence of men's own free actions.[43]

Owing to Cassian's high reputation for asceticism and learning, and by reason of his influential position as abbot of a large monastery, his teaching soon spread far and wide through Southern Gaul. However, Augustine was not without friends and defenders in that same region. Prosper of Aquitaine, a highly educated layman, informed him of what was going on. He replied in two treatises, *De Praedestinatione Sanctorum* and *De Dono Perseverantiæ;* but as they did not have the desired effect, Prosper himself took up his pen in defense of his beloved master. However in his various writings on the subject he did little more than restate and enforce Augustine's teaching. A few of the points he advances may here be presented.

[41] Ibid. 13, 16.
[42] Ibid. 13, 7, 17, 18; 17, 25; Prosp. Ep. 226, 4.
[43] Ibid. 2, 5, 3.

The contention of the Calumniatores, as he calls Cassian and his followers, that man's nature and free will have not been entirely vitiated by sin, that he is of himself still able to desire what is supernaturally good, and that he can pray for and begin the work of salvation, all this is simply untrue and can only be met with a blunt denial. Man is of himself absolutely incapable of beginning the work of salvation; his free will, unless extricated by grace, lies helpless in an abyss of evil and is under the power of the devil. He cannot go to God except by the help of God, nor can he have the beginning of faith except through the Holy Spirit.[44]

Their further contention that grace is sometimes given in view of a man's good disposition is simply a restatement of the Pelagian error; their claim that God calls men indiscriminately goes against the well known fact that many never hear the message of salvation; whilst their teaching that grace is only an *auxilium sine quo non* is utterly false, since it must give us the very power to do good.[45]

Then what the Calumniatores say about predestination cannot be admitted, because God does not predestine men to glory in consideration of their merits, but altogether gratuitously and independently of their good works: "Ut et qui salvantur ideo salvi sint quia illos voluit Deus salvos fieri."[46] In this as in most other points the author simply follows Augustine's view, but with regard to reprobation he is more explicit in stating its true nature. For the reprobate, he says, are predestined to damnation in consequence of God's foreknowledge of their sins.[47] They are not simply passed by in the decree of predestination, but they are excluded from it because God foresaw that they would not be faithful to grace.

This defense of Augustine's teaching had very little effect. Cassian disdained to answer, whilst Vincent of Lerins, in his *Commonitorium,* continued to attack Augustine with virulence, though without mentioning his name. Then Prosper appealed to Pope Xystus III, but obtained no satisfaction; and thus mat-

[44] Resp. ad Cap. Gall. 6.
[45] De Ingratis, 5, 287; Resp. ad Cap. Gall. 4, 5.
[46] Sent. super Cap. Gall. 9.
[47] Resp. ad Cap. Gall. 3, 12.

ters remained for years. Meanwhile, however, the views of the Roman Church had been clearly expressed in a letter of Pope Celestine to the bishops of Southern Gaul, in 431, to which was attached a number of doctrinal canons issued by former Popes, probably by Innocent and Zozimus. These condemn the chief proposition advanced by the Semi-Pelagians, that man of himself can desire, will, and begin a salutary work. Reference is also made to other points of the controversy, but they are put summarily aside as matters about which it does not behoove us to make inquiries.[48]

About the same time an unknown author published a work under the title *De Vocatione Gentium,* which threw considerable light on the matter under discussion. Its main purpose was to reconcile the fact of reprobation with the salvific will of God. To this end the author postulates a twofold call: the one general, which is extended to all men and implies ordinary graces, and the other special, providing for graces that are foreseen to be efficacious. In this way God sincerely wills the salvation of all, and if in spite of this some are lost, the reason is to be sought outside of God. In this way, too, there is a real predestination of the elect, in as much as God by a special decree gives to certain persons graces which He foreknows to be efficacious. But the further question, why these special graces are given to some and not to others, we must leave for solution to the all-wise and all-powerful God.

This rather clear exposition of one point of the controversy, together with the position taken by Rome in regard to the other, should have ended the discussion; but apparently neither the one nor the other did much towards setting men's minds at rest. After the death of Augustine (430) and of Cassian (435), there was a lull of about fifty years, until a book written by Faustus of Riez in Languedoc, *De Gratia Libri Duo,* caused the dispute to break out anew. Faustus was a learned and holy man, who before his elevation to the episcopate had been abbot of Lerins, for some time past a stronghold of Semi-Pelagianism. He first distinguished himself by

[48] P. L. 50, 530.

his determined stand against Predestinarianism, which was advocated by Lucidus, one of his priests. The error of Lucidus, that God predestined some men to eternal punishment, in the sense that He did not give them sufficient grace to work out their salvation, was condemned by the Synods of Arles and Lyons in 472 and 474. It was at the instance of these Synods that Faustus composed his two books on grace.

Concerning the doctrine contained in this work, critics are not agreed. Some regard the author as strongly infected with Semi-Pelagian views, whereas others consider his "Semi-Pelagian formulas as mere verbal exaggerations against Predestinarianism." Whilst resolutely rejecting the errors of Pelagius, he at the same time anathematizes any one who says that Christ did not die for all men, or does not will the salvation of all men, or that those who perish never had the opportunity of being saved. Let men put their free will to good use and God's grace will not be wanting, nor will they be excluded from the number of the elect by reason of predestination. The assumption that God gives special graces to some and denies them to others, in the sense that He wills the former to be saved and passes by the latter, is altogether untenable.

The views of Faustus seem to have been generally accepted by the theologians of Southern France, and in the early part of the sixth century were reproduced in the works of Gennadius of Marseilles. On the other hand, they aroused strong opposition among the Scythian monks at Constantinople. In 519 the monks applied to an African bishop, then tarrying as an exile in the imperial city, for information concerning the standing of Faustus. The bishop laid the matter before Pope Hormisdas, who replied in somewhat vague terms that Faustus was not regarded as an authority of special weight, and that the authentic teaching of the Church on the question of grace might be ascertained from the works of Augustine.

This reply of the Pope did not satisfy the monks, and thereupon they consulted the African bishops who had shortly before been exiled to Sardinia. The latter entered a vigorous protest against the teaching of Faustus. Their answer to the monks was written by Fulgentius, bishop of Ruspe. In this

letter, and in three other works which he wrote before his return to Africa in 523, he strongly defended the teaching of St. Augustine. He took up the matter again in a subsequent work, *De Veritate Prædestinationis et Gratia Dei,* and also in a letter written in the name of a synod of twelve bishops, whom the Scythian monks had again consulted. In these two productions also, he adheres closely to Augustine's views, and regards the teaching of Faustus, especially on predestination, as untenable.

The efforts of Fulgentius produced no more effect than those of Prosper had done almost a century before. Finally, however, the controversy was brought to a close by the intervention of Cæsarius of Arles. He first had the matter considered by a synod held at Valence, probably in 527, and then sent nineteen *Capitula Sancti Augustini* to Rome for approval. Felix IV, who was then Pope, sent back the document in a modified form, having struck out eleven of the *capitula* and added sixteen new ones, all taken from the *Sententiæ Augustini* collected by Prosper. To this list Cæsarius added one proposition, slightly changed some of the others, and then presented the whole, together with a profession of faith, to a synod gathered at Orange, in July 529.

When the bishops, fourteen in number, had subscribed the document, Cæsarius sent it once more to Rome, in order to obtain the confirmation of the Holy See. Pope Felix having meanwhile died, his successor, Boniface II, gave his approval in a letter to the bishop of Arles. He confirmed the decrees of the synod and declared the profession of faith to be "consentanea Catholicis Patrum regulis." He also expressed the hope that the zeal and learning of Cæsarius would soon succeed in bringing back those who had strayed from the right path. This hope was fully realized; for in a short time all the Gallic bishops signified their adhesion to the decisions of the synod, and Semi-Pelamianism practically disappeared from the land.

Thus Augustinianism triumphed, though not all of its views were either approved or accepted. That by Adam's sin human nature was changed for the worse both in body and in soul, that this sin is truly transmitted to Adam's descendants, that the

beginning of faith and of good works is not in the power of man's unaided free will, that grace is necessary for all salutary actions, that merely naturally good works cannot merit grace, that final perseverance must be obtained by prayer — all this is decided and approved; but the question of predestination and reprobation is passed by in silence, except in so far as anathema is pronounced against those who affirm that God predestines some men to sin. It is, however, explicitly declared that baptized persons can and must unite their efforts to divine grace in working out their salvation, and that in this sense their salvation is in their own hands.[49]

[49] Mansi. 8, 712 sqq.

CHAPTER XXV

THE NESTORIAN HERESY: THE COUNCIL OF EPHESUS[1]

Whilst the West was thus engaged in solving such practical questions as the Constitution and Authority of the Church, the Nature of the Sacraments, the Transmission of Original Sin, and the Necessity of Grace, the East continued its speculations on certain Christological problems, which had been only partially solved during the fourth-century controversies. This soon led to new discussions. Hardly had the great champions of orthodoxy, Athanasius, the two Gregorys, Basil, and Chrysostom, been called to their reward, when serious difficulties arose in reference to the union between the human and divine elements in Christ, and also about Mary's title of Theotokos as implied in her Divine Motherhood. The Council of Nicæa had defined Christ's true divinity, and that of Constantinople had declared His perfect manhood; but neither of them had given a direct decision as to what manner of union must be admitted between His humanity and His Godhead, or in what precise relation the Virgin stood to the Son of God. On the other hand, however, the Church's mind on both points had always been sufficiently clear to guide theologians of unswerving loyalty in their teaching; and hence the fourth-century Fathers had incidentally discussed them with all the assurance that is born of faith. Still for such as were less well disposed there was a possible occasion of going astray, and so new errors arose that called for further decisions on the part of the Church.

A — The Nestorian Heresy

The Christological error usually designated as the Nes-

[1] Cfr. Hefele, History of the Councils, III, 4–115; Tixeront, II. D. III, 19–57; * Bethune-Baker, op. cit. 255–279; Hergenroether, Kirchengeschichte, I, 504–518; Marion, Histoire de l'Eglise, I, 451–469; Schwane, H. D. II, 480–534.

torian Heresy, because it was first openly defended by Nestorious, Patriarch of Constantinople, reaches well back into the fourth century. Cyril of Alexandria, the chief opponent of Nestorius, traced it to Diodorus of Tarsus, who died about 390. Diodorus handed it on to his disciple, Theodore of Mopsuestia. This latter was a staunch opponent of Apollinarianism, and in his zeal to uphold Christ's perfect humanity he broached views that were inconsistent with the Saviour's unity of person. The tendency to divide Christ was more or less common to theologians trained in the Antiochene school, which had always emphasized the distinction between Christ's humanity and His Godhead rather than their union. It was in this school that both Theodore and Nestorius were trained.

Theodore's teaching on the subject comes practically to this: The union of the Word with Christ's human nature consists in an indwelling, not of God's being, nor of His power, but of His εὐδοκιά, complacency, good pleasure, or approval. God's being is everywhere, and so is His energizing power; hence neither of them can be said to dwell more especially in one created being than in another; but His complacency or His approval may terminate differently in different persons. This divine indwelling may therefore be more or less perfect, according to God's free determination; hence whilst it is in some measure found in every just man, in Christ it is so perfect that it widely separates Him in this respect from all mankind. Through it He shares in all the honors and in the worship properly due to God alone.

The union thus effected between the human and the divine elements in Christ, although it is of an intimate nature, must not be conceived as a commingling or composition, but rather as a conjunction of the two terms. This conjunction began, in accordance with the divine foreknowledge of the Saviour's disposition, with the first formation of the humanity in the Virgin's womb, and in after life manifested itself in a ready practice of virtue and a determined avoidance of sin. Yet it was only a conjunction of distinct elements, not a union in the strict sense of the term.

Christian tradition always taught the oneness of person in

Christ, and this Theodore also admits, but he explains it by saying: "The two terms united make only one person as man and wife are one flesh. If we consider the natures in their distinction, we must define the nature and the person of the Logos as perfect and complete, and also the nature and the person of the man; but if we have regard to the union, we must say that there is only one person." Hence whilst in his belief he holds fast to the oneness of person in Christ, in his explanation he destroys it altogether.

Consistency required him to do away with the *communicatio idiomatum,* as that is founded on the hypostatic union in the strict sense of the term; yet he retained it in so far as he admitted a participation of the humanity in divine honors and worship. In other respects he simply set it aside. It was not the Son of God, the Logos Incarnate, who suffered and died and rose from the dead; it was only His temple, the humanity, in which He dwelt.

For the same reason he rejected the term Theotokos as applied to the Blessed Virgin. "Mary," he says, "is properly Christotokos, not Theotokos. It is madness to say that God is born of a woman: not God, but the temple in which God dwells, is born of Mary." When reproached that thus he admitted two sons of God in Christ, he expressly repudiated the inference, stating that through the indwelling of the Logos the human nature shares in the same divine sonship.[2]

All this is pure Nestorianism, but as Theodore was primarily intent upon a faithful discharge of his pastoral duties, his Christological speculations attracted little attention except in his own immediate surroundings, and so he escaped condemnation and died in communion with the Church. Matters took, however, a different turn with his pupil Nestorius, who ventured to preach from the housetops what his master had spoken more or less in secret.

Nestorius was at first a monk and then a priest at Antioch, where he soon became favorably known as an ascetic and a

[2] Cfr. fragments of his work De Incarnatione, quoted by Leontius in his treatise Contra Nestorium et Eutychen, P. G. 86, 1267–1396; also P. G. 66.

preacher. Owing to the reputation thus gained, he was in 428 consecrated Patriarch of Constantinople, and on assuming his new charge evinced great zeal for the purity of the faith, thus addressing the Emperor: "Give me, O Emperor, the earth cleansed from heretics, and I will help thee in the wars against the Persians." But before long he himself was condemned as a heretic.

The trouble seems to have started when his chaplain, Anastasius, who had accompanied him from Antioch, began to preach against the use of the term Theotokos. The title had been in common use for a long time, and is found in the writings of Origen, Alexander of Alexandria, Athanasius, Eusebius, and many others; but Anastasius would not allow it. "Let no man," he said, "call Mary Theotokos; for Mary was but a woman, and it is impossible that God should be born of a woman." [3] As this caused great excitement among the people, Nestorius tried to defend his chaplain. In a sermon preached on the subject, he says: "They ask whether Mary may be called Theotokos. But has God then a mother? In that case we must excuse heathenism, which spoke of mothers of the gods; but Paul is not a liar when he says of the Godhead of Christ, that it is without father, without mother, without genealogy. Mary did not bear God; the creature did not bear the Creator, but the man who is the instrument of the Godhead. . . . This garment of which He makes use I honor for the sake of Him who is hidden within it, and is inseparable from it. I separate the natures and unite the reverence. Consider what this means. He who was formed in the womb of Mary was not God Himself, but God assumed him, and because of Him who assumes, he who is assumed is also called God." [4] Hence Mary may be called Theodochos, or Christotokos, but not properly Theotokos.

As regards the union of the divine and the human elements in Christ, he holds that it must be understood as a conjunction of the complete and perfect natures; an indwelling of the Godhead in the humanity, resulting in a moral and sympathetic

[3] Socrates, Hist. Eccl. 7, 32.

[4] Adv. Dei Genitricem Mariam; cfr. Hefele, op. cit. p. 12.

union of the two. "One thing is the Logos who dwells in the temple formed by the Holy Ghost, and another is the temple itself, differing from the God who dwells within it." Yet this moral and sympathetic union suffices to make the two natures, when considered precisely as united, one person. "He who is born of woman is not pure God and not mere man: for the manhood which is born is united with the Godhead." From this it is quite clear that Nestorius, like Theodorus before him, tried to preserve the oneness of person in Christ, but his explanation of the union between the two natures made all his efforts in this direction futile.

In a short while these heterodox views began to spread, and caused not a little apprehension in those who were concerned about the purity of the faith. The first one of real consequence to raise his voice in defense of the traditional teaching of the Church was Cyril of Alexandria, who addressed two strong letters to Nestorius, pointing out the true doctrine and asking him to correct his statements. Although at first evasive in his replies, Nestorius finally cut the correspondence short by practically telling Cyril that he would do much better if he were to attend to his own affairs. Meanwhile, however, he had endeavored to gain the monks of Egypt over to his view. As they were under the jurisdiction of Cyril, the latter thereupon addressed a letter to them, setting forth the true doctrine on the points in question. A few extracts will be sufficient to show us the drift of his teaching.

Reminding them that the great Athanasius, for whom they all entertained the profoundest reverence, had used the title Theotokos quite freely, and that Holy Scripture and the Council of Nicæa clearly teach that the union between the two natures in Christ is most intimate, he exclaims: "Thus then I marvel that there should be any who in the least doubt whether the Holy Virgin ought to be called Mother of God. For if our Lord Jesus Christ is God, how is the Holy Virgin, who brought Him forth, not the Mother of God? . . . But perhaps you will say this: Is then the Virgin, tell me, the mother of the divinity? To this we reply that the living and subsisting Word was truly, without controversy, begotten of the

very essence of God and the Father, and had His being without beginning in time, always coexisting with the Father, in Him and with Him abiding and conceived; but that in these latter times, when He was made flesh, that is, when He was united to a body informed by a rational soul, He was also according to the flesh born of a woman." [5]

The union of the divine and the human in Christ, and the birth of God's own Son of a human mother, he illustrates by an analogy drawn from the birth of human beings in general. What is born of the mother is neither the body nor the soul of the child, taken separately, but the two together as united in oneness of nature and person. Moreover the soul in itself is incapable of being born; it is only its union with the body, derived from the parents, that enables it to be born along with the body. Similarly the Logos, because of its union with human nature, is born along with human nature; and this Logos Incarnate is thus both the Son of God and the Son of the Virgin.[6]

As this letter soon found its way to Constantinople, a new correspondence ensued between the two patriarchs, which was carried on with considerable bitterness on the part of Nestorius. The latter also wrote to Pope Celestine, asking for information concerning certain Pelagian bishops, and stating that a new heresy had sprung up in the East, which seemed to be a mixture of Apollinarianism and Arianism.[7] By this, of course, he meant the teaching of Cyril. He likewise induced certain Alexandrians, who had been punished by Cyril for their moral excesses, to lodge a complaint against their patriarch with the Emperor. In a letter of remonstrance written on this account, Cyril again took occasion to explain his teaching concerning the points under dispute. "The Word," he said, "did not become flesh in such a manner that God's nature had been changed or transformed into a body or soul: on the contrary, the Logos had hypostatically united with Himself the body animated by a rational soul, and thus had, in an inexplicable manner, become man. . . . The two distinct natures had been

[5] Epist. ad Monachos Aegypti, 1, 1, P. G. 77, 13, 21.

[6] Ibid. cc. 18, 19.

[7] Mansi, 4, 1021, 1023.

united into a true unity, and from both one Christ and one Son had come, not as though the difference of the natures had been done away by the union, but, on the contrary, that they constituted the one Lord Jesus Christ and Son by the unutterable union of the Godhead and the manhood." [8]

About the same time Cyril addressed also a letter to the Emperor, Theodosius II, another to his sister Pulcheria, who held the rank of Augusta, and a third to the Empress Eudocia, in each of which he gave a full exposition of the doctrine as taught by the Church. Then, as nothing further could be accomplished, he forwarded his correspondence with Nestorius to the Pope, entreating him to settle the dispute.

Thus fully informed concerning the troubles that disturbed the Eastern Church, Celestine gathered some forty bishops in council, and after a careful examination of the several letters submitted to him, he condemned Nestorius as a heretic, threatening him with deposition unless he retracted his errors within ten days from the time he received the Papal sentence. At the same time he also sent a letter to the church of Constantinople, to John of Antioch, and to Cyril of Alexandria, setting forth the reasons for the condemnation. Furthermore, he appointed Cyril as his representative, with strict orders to execute the sentence in case Nestorius refused to retract.[9] John of Antioch, who had been a fellow student of Nestorius and was his intimate friend, tried to induce him to make the required retractation, urging that the term Theotokos was in perfect accord with Holy Scripture and tradition; but Nestorius, relying on the support of the Emperor, answered in evasive terms and then appealed to a general council.[10]

Meanwhile Cyril called a synod of his suffragans at Alexandria, to draw up a formula of belief which Nestorius was to subscribe if he decided to submit to the judgment of the Pope. The formula begins with the Nicene Creed, then clearly explains the orthodox doctrine of the hypostatic union, and closes with twelve anathematisms, which sum up the contents of the document and anathematize any one who presumes to

[8] Cfr. Hefele, op. cit. p. 21.
[9] Mansi, 4, 550, 1017–1047.
[10] Ibid. 4, 1061; 4, 752.

hold contrary views.[11] A committee, consisting of two Egyptian bishops and two of the Alexandrian clergy, was then sent to Constantinople, with full authority to adjust matters in accordance with the decision of the Pope. The synodal letter, together with the documents from Rome were publicly delivered to Nestorius, but he refused to give an answer. Instead he tried to gain the Emperor over to his side, and when he was fairly sure of being safe on that point, he replied to the anathematisms of Cyril and the Alexandrian synod by issuing twelve counter-propositions, which either rejected the doctrine of Cyril or evaded the issue.[12] The most important of the two sets of propositions are the following:

1°. Cyril: If any one does not confess that Emmanuel is true God, and that therefore the Holy Virgin is Theotokos, since she bore, after the flesh, the Incarnate Son of God; let him be anathema.

Nestorius: If any one says that Emmanuel is true God, and not rather God with us . . . ; and if any one calls Mary the mother of the Logos, and not rather the mother of Him who is Emmanuel . . . ; let him be anathema.

3°. Cyril: If any one separates the hypostases (natures) as to their unity in Christ, connecting them only by a conjunction in dignity, power and appearance, and not rather by conjunction in physical union; let him be anathema.

Nestorius: If any one says that Christ, who is also Emmanuel, is one not (merely) in consequence of the conjunction, but (also) in nature, and does not acknowledge the conjunction of the two natures, that of the Logos and that of the assumed manhood, as still continuing without mingling; let him be anathema.

12°. Cyril: If any one does not confess that the Word of God suffered in the flesh, was crucified in the flesh, and tasted death in the flesh, and became the first-born from the dead, since He as God is life and the life-giver; let him be anathema.

Nestorius: If any one, in confessing the sufferings of the flesh, ascribes them also to the Logos of God, as to the flesh in

[11] Ibid. 4, 1081 sqq.

[12] Ibid. 4, 1099 sqq.

which He appeared, and thus does not distinguish the dignity of the natures; let him be anathema.

One glance at these propositions suffices to show the fundamental difference between the teaching of Cyril and that of Nestorius. Whilst Cyril affirms the Divine Motherhood of Mary, the intrinsic union of the two natures in Christ, and the *communicatio idiomatum,* Nestorius flatly denies all of them, and thereby necessarily rends the one Christ in two. It is not merely a casual difference of view-points, but an essential difference of doctrine. Cyril represents the traditional teaching of the Church, although he expresses it at times somewhat obscurely; Nestorius advances the extreme speculations of a particular school, and in doing so often confuses the issue so as not to oppose openly the current of accepted tradition. He may have been a good man and perhaps even sincere in his contentions, but in that case he was a singularly incompetent theologian.

Harnack in his History of Dogmas tries to show that the Christology of Nestorius was identical with that of the Western Church, and that Pope Celestine through political motives denied his own belief in order to endorse the views of Cyril. To substantiate this assertion he cites from the second letter of Nestorius to the Pope the following passage: "Utraque natura quae per conjunctionem summam et inconfusam in una persona unigeniti adoratur." [13] "This," he states, "was essentially the Occidental formula; Celestine himself knew of nothing else." [14] True, "this was essentially the Occidental formula," as far as appearances go; but in objective significance, as understood by Nestorius, it had nothing in common with Occidental teaching. If the reader will turn back to the chapter on Christology, "The Word Incarnate," he will find ample proof that the Latins understood the union of the two natures in the same sense as Cyril did, and that they had no hesitation whatever about calling Mary the Mother of God. And what these fourth-century writers held, that was also held by Celestine. He did not deny his belief "through politi-

[13] Epist. 2, ad Coelest. Mansi, 4, 1024.

[14] Op. cit. II, 356 sqq. Fourth Germ. Ed.

cal motives," but was intent upon safeguarding the faith that had been delivered to him.

On the other hand, in his opposition to Cyril, Nestorius did not stand alone; he was supported by the Antiochene school in general, and more particularly by John of Antioch, Andrew of Samosata, and the famous Theodoret of Cyrus, all of whom thought they detected in Cyril's writings, and especially in the third and twelfth anathematisms, a restatement of Apollinarian errors. They interpreted the physical union of the two natures affirmed Cyril, and his ascription of the Saviour's sufferings and death to the Incarnate Word, as a denial of the distinction of the united natures in Christ. Cyril answered them by pointing out, what should have been sufficiently evident from his previous letters on the subject, that by the physical union he merely understood a true union as opposed to the mechanical conjunction held by Nestorius, and that the sufferings and death of the Incarnate Word physically affected only His human nature, but by reason of the hypostatic union were rightly ascribed to His divine person. This explanation failed to satisfy his opponents, but the reason of this failure was personal rather than doctrinal.

B — The Council of Ephesus

In order to put an end to these contentions, the Emperors Theodosius II and Valentinian III, acting with the consent of the Pope, made preparation to summon a general council, which should meet at Ephesus. The summons was issued in November, 430, and the date for the first meeting was set for Pentecost, 431. About a month before the council was to meet, the Pope informed the Emperors that he could not appear in person, but would send his legates. He appointed the two bishops Arcadius and Projectus, together with the priest Philip, directing them to support Cyril, but at the same time to safeguard the dignity of the Apostolic See. In a letter which the legates presented to the council, he says: "The legates are to be present at the transactions of the synod, and will give effect to that which the Pope has long ago decided with regard to Nestorius; for he has no doubt that the assem-

bled bishops will agree with this." A special letter had been sent by the Emperors to Augustine of Hippo, but he had died some months before. Candidian and Irenæus, two imperial counts, were commissioned to preserve order.

Nearly 200 bishops, mostly from the East, were present on the appointed day, June 7, 431; but John of Antioch with his forty suffragans was still loitering on the way. When after five days of waiting he failed to appear, although he was in the neighborhood, the bishops concluded that he did not wish to be present at the condemnation of his friend, and so they opened the synod without him. Nestorius was summoned three times to present himself before the council and answer the charge of heresy, but protected by Candidian he refused to come. His case, therefore, had to be adjusted in his absence.

During the first session the second letter of Cyril to Nestorius was read, together with the latter's answer, whereupon the whole assembly cried out: "We all anathematize the impious Nestorius." Then, to submit the doctrinal points at issue to a thorough examination, a number of passages from the writings of the Fathers were presented, which were found to be in perfect agreement with the doctrine as explained by Cyril in his letter to Nestorius. These passages were taken from Peter of Alexandria (+ 311), Athanasius (+ 373), Basil (+ 379), Gregory of Nazianzus (+ 390), Gregory of Nyssa (+ 394), Theophilus of Alexandria (+ 412), Atticus of Constantinople (+ 426), Cyprian of Carthage (258), Pope Felix I (+ 274), Pope Julius I (+ 352), and Ambrose of Milan (+ 397). This was the first time that the argument from the Fathers was introduced into the discussions of a general council, although in local synods and controversies it had often been invoked before.

In opposition to these passages there were next read some twenty extracts from the writings of Nestorius, in which His heterodox views were clearly expressed. Further discussion seemed superfluous, especially as the Pope had directed the council simply to execute the sentence already pronounced by himself. Hence a decree of deposition was drawn up, which

concluded with the words: "Urged by the canons, and in accordance with the letter of our most Holy Father Celestine, the Roman Bishop, we have come, with many tears, to this sorrowful sentence against him, namely, that our Lord Jesus Christ, whom he has blasphemed, decrees by the holy Synod that Nestorius be excluded from the episcopal dignity, and from all priestly communion." The sentence was then subscribed by all the bishops present.

This first session of the Council lasted from early in the morning till late at night, yet the whole day long enormous crowds of the faithful were waiting at the doors of "Holy Mary," the church in which the session was held, to learn the decision of the bishops on a matter which they had so much at heart. When at last the doors were opened and the result of the deliberation was announced, the people shouted for joy, praised the holy Synod, and, gathering in procession, escorted the bishops with torches and censers to their dwellings. The whole city was illuminated, and there was joy in every house, because Holy Mary was in truth Theotokos, the Mother of God. A similar demonstration took place somewhat later at Constantinople. These popular outbursts show perhaps better than anything else how definite a shape the doctrine under discussion had assumed in the belief of the faithful. At the same time they afford an instance of the infallibility of the *sensus fidelium.*

A few days later John of Antioch arrived, accompanied by his forty suffragans. When he learned what had been done, he showed himself greatly displeased and immediately called a meeting of his own bishops, which declared the first session of the Council irregular and void, and then excommunicated Cyril and his adherents. All attempts on the part of the council to come to an understanding proved fruitless, as John was supported by the Emperor's representatives, who had been instructed to sustain Nestorius.

Meanwhile, however, the Council continued its work. It finished in the seventh session, when, besides issuing six canons in reference to recalcitrant prelates and priests, it also drew up a circular letter, which was to be sent to all the churches. In

this letter the bishops set forth that the Synod had pronounced excommunication against John of Antioch and the bishops who had taken his part. This ended the Council, but not the dispute.

As the Emperor, through misunderstanding rather than through ill will, supported Nestorius and his friends against the decision that had been given by the assembled bishops, a deadlock ensued which lasted till the end of August. Both parties sent appeals to the court, but the members of the council could obtain no hearing. Their opponents so far prevailed on the Emperor that he ordered Cyril of Alexandria and Memnon of Ephesus to be deposed from their sees and cast into prison. Finally, however, through the intervention of the monks at Constantinople and the influence of Pulcheria, the Emperor's eyes were opened to the true state of things. Then the deposition of Nestorius was ratified, and Maximian, a priest of Constantinople, was consecrated in his stead. After this the council was officially dissolved, Cyril and Memnon were reinstated, and the bishops received permission to return to their sees.

Whilst the disputes just referred to were going on, John and his followers drew up a formula of belief, which some time later became the means of reuniting the two parties; hence it is called the Union Creed. From it one can readily see that the dissension arose from personal animosity rather than from a real difference in faith. The part referring to the points then under discussion reads as follows: "We acknowledge that our Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, is true God and true man, consisting (as man) of a rational soul and a body; that He was born before all time of the Father as to His Godhead, and was in the end of days, for us and for our salvation, born of the Virgin as to His manhood, of one substance with the Father in respect to His Godhead, and of one substance with us in respect to His manhood. For the two natures are united together, and therefore we acknowledge one Christ, one Lord, and one Son. On account of this union, which is however far from being a mingling, we also confess that the Holy Virgin is Theotokos,

because God the Word was made flesh, and by the incarnation, from the time of His conception, has united the manhood which He assumed of her with Himself." This ended the dispute between Catholics, but as a separate sect Nestorianism has survived to the present day.

CHAPTER XXVI

THE MONOPHYSITE HERESY: THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON[1]

Although there are in Christ two distinct natures, the divine and the human, yet they are not separated: by reason of the hypostatic union they form one being, one person, one Christ, one Son of God Incarnate. This was the teaching of Cyril in opposition to that of Nestorius, and this teaching was dogmatically defined by Pope Celestine and the Council of Ephesus. But even before the death of Cyril, which occurred in 444, some of his followers emphasized the union to such an extent that the human element in Christ seemed more or less absorbed by the divine. This view found its fullest expression in the heresy of Eutyches, which is known to history as Monophysitism or Monophysism, because it defends the oneness of nature in Christ.

A — The Monophysite Heresy

Eutyches was an enthusiastic follower of Cyril, and as archimandrite or abbot of an important monastery near Constantinople he had contributed not a little to the final overthrow of Nestorius. In 448, when he had been a monk for more than threescore years, he was accused by Eusebius of Dorylæum, his former friend, of Apollinarian tendencies. A Synod of some thirty bishops, just then gathered at Constantinople by the Patriarch Flavian, summoned him to clear himself of the charge. At first he refused to come, but finally he was prevailed upon to answer the summons.

His doctrinal statements before the Synod were too vague and guarded to be satisfactory, and when the question was

[1] Cfr. Hefele, History of the D. III, 76–94; *Bethune-Baker, Councils, III, 285–449; Tixeront, H. o. c. 281–300.

put to him: "Do you confess the existence of two natures even after the incarnation, and that Christ is consubstantial with us?" he tried to evade the issue. This, however, did not satisfy his questioners, and as they pressed him for a clear statement of his belief, he replied: "I confess that before the union (of the Godhead and manhood) Christ was of two natures, but after the union I confess only one nature."[2] Urged to conform to the orthodox teaching, which held that the two natures, though hypostatically united, remained nevertheless distinct after the union, he protested that for peace sake he was willing to do so, but as he could not find this teaching either in Holy Scripture or in the writings of the Fathers, he could not pronounce anathema upon the opposite doctrine. When all further urging proved useless, the patriarch in the name of the Synod pronounced sentence of deposition and excommunication.

Supported by the Emperor, Eutyches now set to work to gain the people of Constantinople over to his side. He put up placards all over the city, setting forth the justice of his cause. Then, to secure ecclesiastical support, he sent letters to Alexandria, Jerusalem, Thessalonica, and Ravenna, appealing at the same time to Pope Leo for an authoritative decision and for protection. Dioscorus of Alexandria and Juvenal of Jerusalem promised their support, while Peter Chrysologus, bishop of Ravenna, replied that he could do nothing in the matter without the consent of the Pope. Leo, however, refused to intervene until he had heard from the other side.

Meanwhile Flavian had dispatched a letter to Rome, fully explaining the situation. This enabled Leo to take the matter in hand, and he did so without delay. He notified Flavian that judgment would be given, and sometime later he sent his famous *Epistola Dogmatica ad Flavianum,* in which the orthodox doctrine was clearly set forth and the condemnation of Eutyches sustained. In the introduction he points out that "the very Creed itself refutes him (Eutyches): and old as he is, he does not comprehend what every catechumen in the

[2] Mansi, 6, 744.

world confesses; for to declare belief in God the Father all-ruling, and in Jesus Christ our Lord, who was born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary, is really to overthrow the devices of almost all heretics." Then he makes the following four points:

1°. Christ is only one person: the Word and Christ are not two, but one individual being. One and the same person is truly the Son of God and truly the Son of man.

2°. In that one person are two natures, the divine and the human, without confusion, without mingling, so that each nature retains undiminished what is proper to itself.

3°. Each one of the two natures has its own proper activity, which, however, is not independent of the other, nor outside the union which is permanent; but nevertheless it is an activity of which the nature in question is the immediate principle.

4°. From the unity of person necessarily follows the *communicatio idiomatum,* so that what is proper to one nature may in the concrete be predicated of the other. Hence also we confess in the Symbol that the only-begotten Son of God was crucified and buried.

Neither Leo nor Flavian desired to submit the matter to a council, but, without consulting them, Theodosius summoned the bishops of the Empire to meet at Ephesus. Informed of this, the Pope, in order to show his good will, gave his consent, and chose as his legates Bishop Julius of Puteoli, a priest by the name of Renatus, and the deacon Hilarius. On their departure from Rome he entrusted to them a letter which was to be read at the opening of the Council. In this he strongly reminded the assembled bishops of the authority of the Apostolic See in matters of faith.

The Council met in August, 449, with Dioscorus of Alexandria as president. He was attended by a strong body of Egyptian bishops and monks, all opposed to Flavian and Eusebius of Dorylaeum. They behaved in a manner much more becoming a frenzied mob than a deliberative assembly of churchmen. Eusebius, who had first called attention to the error of Eutyches, was accused of dividing Christ. "Bury him alive," they shouted; "as he has divided Christ, so let

him be divided himself." Flavian was mobbed by the monks who accompanied Barsumas of Nisibis; Dioscorus refused to have the letter of Leo read, and the statements of Eutyches were received with applause. The Egyptians asserted boldly that after the union the distinction of the two natures no longer existed, and the outcome of it all was that Eutyches was declared orthodox and restored to his ecclesiastical dignity, while all his opponents were deposed.

Flavian and the Roman legates protested against these proceedings but they had to flee for their lives. After they had departed, a blank paper was handed around which all the bishops present, 135 in number, were forced to sign. When this had been done, the decisions of the Council were recorded over their signatures. When Leo was informed of these proceedings, he severely denounced the action of Dioscorus and designated the council as a *Latrocinium,* a Robber Synod, by which name it has ever since been known in history.

The Emperor, however, not only approved the work of the Council, but put its decisions into immediate execution. He denounced all opposing bishops as Nestorians and sent them into exile. Flavian died shortly afterwards and was succeeded by Anatolius. The result of these stringent measures was general confusion and universal dissatisfaction. Egypt, Thrace, and Palestine held with Dioscorus and the Emperor; whilst Syria, Pontus, and Asia protested loudly against the treatment of Flavian and the acquittal of Eutyches. These latter were supported by Rome, and Leo, excommunicated by Dioscorus, excommunicated him in turn and demanded a new council. However as long as Theodosius lived nothing could be done. But he died in the following year, and then the way was opened for a settlement.

B — The Council of Chalcedon

Theodosius was succeeded by his sister Pulcheria, who had been associated with him in the rule of the Empire as Augusta ever since 415. On her accession to the throne she bestowed her hand on Marcian, a very able and universally beloved general of the army. Both were devout adherents of the orthodox

party, and they took immediate steps to settle the dispute by convoking a council. In this they forestalled Leo who had meanwhile changed his mind, but as the summons had already been sent out before he knew of it, he gave his consent. Ephesus was the place chosen for the meeting; however this proved too inconvenient for the Emperor who wished to be present, and so Chalcedon was substituted. There, on October 8, 451, about 600 bishops, nearly all from the East, gathered for the first session. The Pope had sent as his legates the bishops Paschinus and Lucentius, and the priest Boniface. Paschinus was designated by Leo as president of the council, "vice mea Synodo convenit praesidere." [3]

Besides this, the Pope made it clearly understood that he did not want further discussion, but simply a declaration of the faith along the lines marked out in his letter to Flavian. "It is not lawful to defend," he wrote, "what it is not lawful to believe, and in our letter to Flavian, of blessed memory, it was most fully and clearly pointed out what is, according to the authority of the Gospel, the declaration of the Prophetic Spirit, and the teaching of the Apostles, the pious and sincere profession of faith concerning the mystery of the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ." [4] In accordance with this, therefore, the Council must formulate its decision; hence the Council could only define what had already been defined by the Pope.

After some rather violent scenes, occasioned by the exclusion of Dioscorus and his accomplices in the Robber Synod, the following five documents were read and universally approved: The Creed of Nicæa; the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed, here for the first time ascribed to the Second General Council; the fourth letter of Cyril to Nestorius; Cyril's letter to John of Antioch, in anticipation of the reunion; and Leo's *Epistola Dogmatica*. This last was received with loud applause, the whole assembly crying out: "Peter hath spoken by the mouth of Leo."

The Council was decidedly in favor of not drawing up a new formula of faith, but the Emperor insisted that some Creed must be presented for subscription to all the bishops,

[3] Ep. 89; cfr. Ep. 103. [4] Ep. 90.

for the purpose of ascertaining their orthodoxy. Thereupon a lengthy discussion ensued, in course of which it became manifest that many Eastern bishops had either decidedly Monophysitic leanings, or at least preferred the terminology of Cyril to that of Leo. As, however, the legates insisted that Leo's definition must be embodied in the proposed formula, or they would take their departure and arrange for a council in the West, the following Creed was drawn up and subscribed by 335 bishops, many of the others being disqualified to vote on account of the part they had taken in the Robber Synod.

After stating that the bishops present accepted the Creed of Nicæa and of Constantinople, and also the letter of Cyril and the *Epistola Dogmatica* of Leo, the document proceeds: "Following, therefore, the holy Fathers, we all confess and teach, with one accord, one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, at once perfect in Godhead and perfect in manhood, truly God and truly man, having a rational soul and a body; of one essence with the Father as regards His Godhead, and at the same time of one essence with us as regards His manhood, on account of us and our salvation begotten in the last days of Mary the Virgin, Mother of God; one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-Begotten, proclaimed in two natures, without confusion, without change, without division, without separation; the difference of the natures being in no way destroyed on account of the union, but rather the peculiar property of each nature being preserved and concurring in one person and one hypostasis — not as though parted or divided into two persons, but one and the same Son and only-begotten God the Word, Lord, Jesus Christ, even as the Prophets from of old and the Lord Jesus Christ taught us concerning Him, and the Creed of the Fathers has handed down to us." [5]

"In this definition the Church at length pronounced a final verdict on both extremes of Christological opinion, clearly repudiating Apollinarian, Nestorian, and Eutychian teaching, and stating positively in a few words the relation between the two natures in the one person: the relation which was more fully expressed in the statements of Cyril and Leo, to which,

[5] Mansi, 7, 116.

by recognition on this occasion, conciliar authority was given."[6] This is the Protestant view of the final outcome of these lengthy discussions, which is correct in every way, except in one important particular: it was not the Council that gave authority to the decision of Leo, as the author states, but it was Leo who gave authority to the decision of the Council, as is quite evident from what has been said in the preceding paragraphs. He simply dictated to the assembled bishops what decision they should reach.

Before the Council closed, twenty-seven canons were drawn up, all of which are disciplinary, and need therefore not be considered here. To these a twenty-eighth was added in the absence of the Papal legates, which gave the second rank in the universal Church to the Patriarch of Constantinople, besides placing the whole of Pontus, Proconsular Asia, and Thrace under his jurisdiction, and making it obligatory upon the metropolitans of these regions to ask consecration from him. When the legates learned what had been done, they protested vigorously, contending that this was contrary to the ruling of Nicæa and an encroachment on the rights of the Holy See. Leo, too, when asked to confirm the council, refused to ratify this canon. Apparently the Greeks yielded, and even omitted the canon from their collections, but in practice they clung to all the privileges it granted. It always remained a cause of trouble, until, on the establishment of the Latin Empire at Constantinople in 1215, the Fourth Lateran ratified it in its fifth canon.

In the Creed cited above, the faith of the Church was defined; and "writing, composing, or teaching any other creed" was forbidden under severe penalties; but the Eutychian error was by no means suppressed. Considerable bodies of Christians refused to accept the doctrine of two natures, at least in the terms used at Chalcedon, although they were quite ready to condemn the teaching of the extreme Monophysites, who held that the human nature of Christ was absorbed by the divine. Accordingly numerous secessions from the Church took place, the seceders asserting one incarnate nature, without

[6] *Bethune-Baker, o. c. 286.

however explaining how, precisely, the oneness of nature was effected in the God-Man. In Palestine and Egypt serious rioting and bloodshed followed. Large numbers of monks and lay people, led by such recalcitrant bishops as Timothy Ælurus (the Cat), Peter Mongus, and Peter the Fuller, rose in open rebellion against those who accepted the Council. Peace was at last restored, but only when wide regions had been lost to the Church.

It must be noted, however, that very many of those who left the Church, both bishops and people, were in reality schismatics rather than heretics. They contended, indeed, for one incarnate nature in Christ, but they admitted at the same time that this incarnate nature was made up of two distinct substances, the divine and the human, which remained somehow distinct even in the union. They professed to follow the teaching, not of Eutyches, but of Cyril of Alexandria, from whom they took the expression, "one incarnate nature." But while they thus professed the orthodox doctrine in antiquated terminology, they made the great mistake of not adopting the language of the Church, when the new heresy called for the substitution of clearer terms.[7] Thus it was their want of submission, not their want of faith, that cut them off from the Church. But from schism to heresy is but a short step, and in the course of years many of these orthodox opponents of the Council of Chalcedon joined the Eutychian party, and in consequence did away with all objective distinction between the two natures in Christ. Hence the Monophysites of to-day are not only schismatics, but heretics as well; and, like all heretics, split up into a vast variety of sects.

By way of supplement to the foregoing discussion, something must here be said about St. Cyril's relation to the Monophysites. Whilst he was universally regarded as the great champion of orthodoxy against Nestorius, he was at the same time claimed by many of the Monophysite leaders as an authority for their teaching; and this claim is considered as justified by a large number of modern Protestant writers. Hence it

[7] Cfr. Tixeront, o. c. 99–123.

is necessary to investigate briefly the reasons upon which this claim is based.[8]

The most obvious reason, no doubt, is the fact that the Monophysites formulated their doctrine in the very terms used by Cyril. Their watchword, "One incarnate nature of God the Word," was his watchword also; and the statement of Eutyches: "I confess that before the union Christ was of two natures, but after the union I confess only one nature," is likewise found in his writings:[9] but he used both expressions in a perfectly orthodox sense, which his followers seem to have overlooked. This oversight on their part was, no doubt, largely owing to Cyril's peculiar terminology. Thus φύσις and ὑπόστασις, which the Cappadocians had already distinguished as nature and person, were employed by him as identical in meaning, signifying a concrete, individual, and independently existing nature, or simply a person as distinguished from nature. He hardly ever designated the human nature of Christ by φύσις only, but usually added some qualification to show that the idea of personality was excluded. And hence when he says that after the incarnation Christ is μία φύσις, he does not mean that Christ has only one nature, but that He is only one person. And again, when he says that before the union there were δύο φύσεις, and after the union only μία φύσις, he refers not to natures but to persons; without, however, intending to imply that the human nature ever had a distinct personality of its own which was lost in the union.[10]

In this particular Cyril's terminology is peculiar, and altogether different from that employed in the Antiochene school at the time. The latter also identified φύσις and ὑπόστασις, but to signify nature, in opposition to πρόσωπον or person. Hence much of the opposition that Cyril experienced on the part of John of Antioch and Theodoret of Cyrus arose precisely from the different meaning they attached to the terms that were used. When Cyril spoke of μία φύσις, his adversaries understood him to mean one nature; and when they defended δύο φύσεις in Christ, Cyril inferred that they meant

[8] Ibid. 58–75.
[9] Epist. 40, ad Acac.
[10] Cfr. Bardenhewer, Patrol. 366.

two persons. It was only after much acrimonious contention and lengthy explanations that they came to understand each other's theological language; and that understanding once reached, they found that they agreed in doctrine. And as Cyril's terms were thus misunderstood by his Catholic adversaries, so were they also misunderstood by his Monophysite followers.

At the same time, however, it must not be forgotten that the Alexandrian and Antiochene schools approached the Christological problem from entirely different view-points. The latter always reasoned from the distinction of the natures in Christ to the unity of person, with the result that the distinction was very much emphasized; whilst the former started from the unity of person and derived thence the distinction of the two natures, with the contrary result that the unity received special emphasis. In the one case the two distinct natures are regarded as united, and therefore Christ is one person; in the other case the person is considered as having assumed a second nature, and therefore Christ has two natures. Hence the Antiochenes would say that Christ is one person because of the union, while the Alexandrians would prefer the expression that Christ is one person in spite of the union. It was exactly the same doctrine, as considered from one view-point or the other; but overemphasis in the one case led to Nestorianism, and overemphasis in the other ended in Monophysism. Yet whilst John and Theodoret are not considered as Nestorians, it would be unfair to look upon Cyril as a Monophysite.

Nor did he fail to repudiate all such imputations in the most emphatic language. When through a misunderstanding of his terms the confusion of the two natures in Christ was laid to his charge, he replied without hesitation: "He is mighty foolish who asserts any such confusion or mixture. Considering the manner in which the incarnation took place, we see that the two natures are united in an indissoluble union, without confusion and without transformation; for the flesh is flesh and not the divinity, although it is the flesh of God; and similarly the Word is God and not the flesh, although through

the incarnation the flesh has become God's very own." [11] In the same sense he explains the terms used by some older writers, who at times called the union κρᾶσις or mixture; they thereby, he says, only meant to indicate the intimate nature of the union.[12] The same also follows from his famous saying about the Divine Motherhood of Mary: "A perfect, sufficient, and irreproachable profession of faith is found in the assertion of the Divine Maternity of the Blessed Virgin"; because if Christ were not truly God after the union, her maternity would not be "divine"; if He were not at the same time also truly man, it would not be a "maternity" at all.[13]

Hence whilst it is perhaps true that Cyril unconsciously prepared the way for Monophysism, on account of his peculiar and obscure terminology, he cannot in justice be charged with leanings in that direction. Others who later on expressed their belief in almost the same terms, were indeed accounted Monophysites; but they wrote after the Council of Chalcedon had fixed orthodox terminology in this regard, whereas he wrote before that work had been accomplished, which makes all the difference in the world.

The same must be remarked about the later contention of some Monothelites, who invoked Cyril's authority for asserting only one will and one operation in Christ. He never treated the subject *ex professo,* and from his casual remarks on the subject one may perhaps infer either the one or the other view, according to one's own bias in the matter; but certain it is, that, whilst he admitted only one acting subject in Christ, or one subject of predication, he at the same time distinguished between divine and human actions in the Saviour. Aside from particular texts, this necessarily follows from his doctrine that both natures are complete and perfect after the union, since that inevitably implies two distinct principles of action, each endowed with its own natural activity.

[11] Epist. 45.
[12] Adv. Nest. 1, 3.
[13] Hom. 15 De Incarn. Verbi.

CHAPTER XXVII

SOME NEW DISSENSIONS: THE THREE CHAPTERS: THE FIFTH GENERAL COUNCIL[1]

When Zeno came to the throne in 474, the Monophysite trouble was at its height. His own preferences seem to have been for the heretics, but circumstances compelled him to be conciliatory to Catholics. Hence he conceived the idea of bringing together the different parties by more or less suppressing the particular points of doctrine that were at the root of the dissension. With this end in view, he issued the famous *Henoticon,* or Union Decree, which extolled the first three Councils, referred slurringly to that of Chalcedon, and carefully avoided all mention of nature and person in Christ. It aimed at conciliating all parties, but pleased none. Yet the Emperor insisted on its acceptance by all, and resolutely deposed Catholic and Monophysite bishops alike, if they refused to subscribe. The result was universal dissatisfaction.

A — Some New Dissensions

In this desperate state of things, the Eastern bishops appealed to Rome for protection against the unwarranted interference of the Emperor in ecclesiastical affairs. John Talaias, Catholic Patriarch of Alexandria, visited Rome in person to obtain help from the Pope. As a result, Felix III, in 483, sent legates to Constantinople, both to obtain a legal recognition of the Council of Chalcedon and to assert the rights of the deposed bishops. However the Emperor, by threats and bribery, gained the legates over to his side, and in consequence nothing was accomplished. When the Pope was informed of what

[1] Cfr. Hefele, History of the Councils, IV, 229–363; Tixeront, H. D. III, 124–144; Schwane, H. D. II, 567–574; Hergenroether, op. cit. I, 600–613.

had happened, he convened a synod at Rome, for the purpose of taking stringent measures against the disturbers of the peace. He excommunicated Acacius, Patriarch of Constantinople, who was regarded as the originator of the Emperor's foolish scheme, and who openly fraternized with the Monophysites. Acacius retaliated by striking the Pope's name from the diptychs, and, protected by the Emperor, continued to discharge his patriarchal functions in spite of the Papal excommunication.

Thus originated the first Greek schism, which lasted for thirty-five years, or from 484 to 519. It was only during the reign of the Catholic Emperor Justin I, that the Patriarch John, the fifth successor of Acacius, acceded to the demands of Rome. He subscribed the famous formula of Pope Hormisdas, in which the Council of Chalcedon and all the letters of Pope Leo on matters of faith are received without reserve. It concludes as follows:

"And thus I hope that I may deserve to be with thee in the one communion of faith preached by the Apostolic See, in which is found the entire and the truthful and the perfect firmness of the Christian religion: promising that for the future the names of those who are separated from the communion of the Catholic Church, that is, those not agreeing with the Apostolic See, are not to be recited in the Sacred Mysteries. But if in anything I should deviate from this my pledge, I confess to be by my own judgment an accomplice of those whom I have condemned. And this my pledge I have subscribed with my own hand, and directed to thee, Hormisdas, the holy and venerable Pope in the city of Rome." [2]

This formula was subscribed by nearly all the Eastern bishops, and thus the schism was healed; but the seeds of it remained, to spring up at a more opportune time. Yet it must not be overlooked how clear a testimony the subscription of this formula bears to the Primacy of Rome as acknowledged by the Eastern Church on that occasion.

During the time of the Acacian schism another dispute arose out of the expression, "Unus ex Trinitate crucifixus est," one

[2] P. L. 68, 460.

of the Trinity was crucified. It was Peter Fuller, the Monophysite Patriarch of Antioch, who introduced the phrase into the *Trisagion,* "Deus sanctus, Deus fortis, Deus immortalis," by adding to it, "qui crucifixus es pro nobis." Thereby he intended to imply that the divinity had in some way absorbed the human nature in Christ, and that consequently the sufferings of the cross had directly affected the divine nature. This was obviously heretical; yet in itself the expression admitted of a perfectly orthodox sense, in as much as the divine person could be said to have suffered in His human nature. Hence many Catholics felt no scruple in reciting the *Trisagion* in the amended form, whilst others regarded it as a profession of the Monophysite error, and so it became an apple of discord among Eastern Catholics.

The matter was brought to the notice of ecclesiastical authority by some Scythian monks at Constantinople, who were of opinion that the Council of Chalcedon had done scant justice to the teaching of Cyril in regard to the *communicatio idiomatum.* With this in mind, they demanded that the formula, "Unus ex Trinitate passus est," as they worded it, should be solemnly approved. But neither the Patriarch John nor the Papal legates would agree to this, although they did not reject the formula itself. Then appeal was made to Pope Hormisdas, but he also refused; because on account of the interpretation put upon it by the Monophysites it appeared dangerous to use the expression, and besides the Council of Chalcedon stood in no need of correction. Meanwhile the friends of John Maxentius, who was the leader of the monks, approached a number of theologians, among them Fulgentius of Ruspe, and Dionysius Exiguus, to obtain their opinion on the orthodoxy of the formula. As they received a favorable answer they became the more insistent, but all their efforts were unavailing; if they wished to use the expression they might do so, but the Pope had no mind to make its use obligatory.

Whilst this was going on, another party of monks, the Acemeti, or the Sleepless Ones, attacked the formula as heretical and fell back into Nestorianism. Thereupon the dogmatizing Emperor Justinian endeavored to obtain an of-

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

ficial approval of it from Rome, but John II, who was then Pope, and after him Agapetus I, did not fall in with his views. However Justinian was not the man to be disconcerted by the opposition of Popes, and so he presented his request to the Fifth General Council, in 553, and succeeded in having the formula approved. In all this there was obviously no difference of doctrine between Pope and Pope, or between Pope and Council, but only a question of expedience as suggested by the circumstances of the times.

It was also at the instance of Justinian that certain propositions taken from the works of Origen were condemned, almost three hundred years after the author's death. The Emperor's attention had been called to them, it seems, by the Roman deacon Pelagius, who a few years later became Pope, and also by some Palestinian monks. He forthwith composed a long document containing twenty extracts from the *Peri Archon,* which bore on the preëxistence of souls, the *apokatastasis,* etc. These he essayed to refute, and then ended up with ten anathemas against the Alexandrian doctor. At the same time he directed the Patriarch Mennas to call a synod and settle this matter ecclesiastically.

The synod met in 543, and after much discussion fifteen propositions were drawn up from the extracts submitted and condemned as contrary to the faith. These the Emperor sent around to the various churches, and it appears that Pope Vigilius, all the patriarchs, and most of the bishops subscribed the condemnation. For a long time the propositions in question were considered to have been drawn up and condemned by the Fifth General Council, but it is now satisfactorily established that they originated as here indicated, and that the Council included Origen only in a general condemnation of heretics.[3]

B — The Three Chapters

As early as 531, the Emperor had gathered a Synod of Orthodox and Monophysite bishops for the purpose of effect-

[3] Mansi, 9, 201, 533.

ing a union. At this Synod the writings of the Pseudo-Areopagite were cited, only to be immediately rejected as spurious. The Emperor's efforts towards bringing about a union came to nothing, but he kept the project in mind for future opportunities.

Hence when the Origenist bishop of Cæsarea, Theodore Askidas, in his anxiety to divert the Emperor's attention from Origen, suggested that the union with the Monophysites would be much facilitated if the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret of Cyrus, and Ibas of Edessa were to be condemned, the imperial dogmatizer eagerly took up the suggestion. In 543 he published a letter on the matter, which ended up with a condemnation of Theodore, some of the writings of Theodoret, and the letter of Ibas to Maris. The writings of these three men thus condemned, together with the authors, are known in history as the Three Chapters. The matter had already been brought up at the Council of Chalcedon, but the assembled bishops abstained from issuing a formal condemnation, and even reinstated Theodoret and Ibas in their sees, after they had subscribed a formula of faith which anathematized Nestorius. For this reason the Emperor inserted in his condemnation of the Three Chapters the following clause: "If any one say that we took this course for the purpose of suppressing or setting aside the holy Fathers who were gathered in Council at Chalcedon, let him be anathema." Hence the decisions of the Council were to remain in force, nor was anything to be attempted contrary to the minds of those holy Fathers.

Thus safeguarded, the letter was sent around for subscription, and nearly all the Eastern bishops complied with the Emperor's wishes, though it may well be presumed that many did so against their better judgment. The Western bishops, however, and also Pope Vigilius, declared themselves against the condemnation. The Pope had been urged to take this stand by the deacon Ferrandus of Carthage, whose advice he had asked in the matter. To break down this opposition, Justinian had the Pope conveyed to Constantinople, where he at first treated him with all the consideration due to the Father

of Christendom. The Pope attributed this friendly attitude of the Emperor to a change of views in regard to the Three Chapters, and proceeded to excommunicate Mennas and the other bishops who had subscribed the condemnation. But little by little Justinian made him understand that the condemnation must remain in force, with the result that Vigilius was prevailed upon to issue his *Judicatum,* wherein he completely reversed his former judgment. In this document he condemns the person and writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia, the letter of Ibas and all those who approved it, and such writings of Theodoret as were against the true faith and the anathematisms of Cyril, "salva tamen Concilii Chalcedonensis auctoritate."[4] Thus the Emperor triumphed, but the West turned against the Pope, and the African Church even excommunicated him until he had done penance.

Apparently neither the Pope nor the Emperor had anticipated this strong opposition from the West; for on realizing it they quietly withdrew the *Judicatum* and came to an understanding that the whole matter should be settled in a general council. After a little while, however, Justinian changed his mind, and in 551 once more condemned the Three Chapters. When Vigilius heard of this he fled to Chalcedon, where he took sanctuary in the Church of Saint Euphemia. Thus safe from the Emperor, he published a sentence of deposition against Theodore Askidas, the Emperor's adviser, and a sentence of suspension against the Patriarch Mennas. The latter died shortly after this, and his successor Eutychius effected a reconciliation with the Pope, who had meanwhile returned to Constantinople. In this condition matters remained until the opening of the council.

C — The Fifth General Council

After publishing the *Professio Fidei,* in which he once again condemned the Three Chapters, the Emperor summoned the bishops to meet in council at Constantinople, as had been agreed upon between him and the Pope. In May, 553, about

[4] Mansi, 9, 181, 104; P. L. 69, 111.

160 bishops had arrived, who were nearly all from the East. When Vigilius was informed of this, he changed his mind about the council, being unwilling to submit his dispute with the Emperor to a gathering of almost exclusively Eastern bishops. He suggested Italy or Sicily as the proper place for the meeting, and stipulated an equal representation from the East and the West. This was precisely what Justinian tried to avoid, and so he would not listen to the suggestion. As both parties refused to yield, the Council opened without the Pope, Eutychius acting as president.[5]

Whilst the Council was thus holding its sessions without proper sanction, Vigilius wrote another document, called the *Constitutum,* in which he considerably modified his judgment on the Three Chapters as contained in his earlier *Judicatum.* After summing up what had been done thus far, and subjecting the points under discussion to a thorough examination, he condemned the writings of Theodore, but not his person, deeming it unbecoming to anathematize the dead; then, as the writings of Theodoret had not been condemned at Chalcedon, although they had been discussed there, he would not condemn them either; lastly, he took the same position with regard to the letter of Ibas, being satisfied with anathematizing in a general way all writings against the true faith, whoever might be the author. He concluded by prohibiting all clerics either to add to, or to take from, or to change in any way, the decisions of the Council of Chalcedon; also forbidding all persons, of whatever ecclesiastical degree or dignity, to write, publish, compose, or teach anything contrary to the present *Constitutum,* or to agitate anew, after this definition, the question of the Three Chapters.[6]

This determined stand taken by Vigilius greatly offended the Emperor, and he ordered the Council to break off communion with the Pope, contending that he had made himself a *particeps* in the heresy of Nestorius. The Council obeyed, but, at the Emperor's suggestion, explicitly professed to continue in communion with the Apostolic See: "Servemus itaque

[5] Mansi, 9.

[6] Mansi, 9, 61–106; P. L. 69, 114.

unitatem ad Apostolicam sacrosanctae Ecclesiae sedem antiquioris Romae."[7] This is the first instance of the notorious distinction "inter sedem et sedentem," which in later centuries was to play so important a part in the pretensions of the Gallican Church. By the step thus taken, however, the council from being merely insubordinate became *ipso facto* schismatical. It held only one more session, during which a document was composed that reviewed the whole question of the Three Chapters and launched fourteen anathemas already contained in the Emperor's *Professio Fidei*. It ended with a sentence of deposition against all bishops and clerics, and a sentence of excommunication against all monks and laics, who dared spread, teach, or write anything contrary to the dispositions thus made.

As soon as the Council had been dissolved, the Emperor took measures to secure the subscription of all the bishops who had failed to attend the meeting. He was quite successful in the East, but in the West he encountered a determined resistance, although he did not shrink from using violence in enforcing his will. Vigilius himself seems to have been banished for a while, but he ended by yielding to the Emperor's wishes. In a letter to Eutychius he condemned the Three Chapters in the sense of the Council, and annulled whatever he and others had done to uphold them.[8] He expressed himself similarly in a new *Constitutum*, probably addressed to the Latin bishops.[9] Then, after an absence of seven years, he was allowed to return to Rome, but he died before he reached his destination. His successor Pelagius, although at first opposed to the council, in his turn ended by accepting it.[10] This gave rise to numerous local schisms in the West. Many bishops in Illyria, Dalmatia, Istria, Venetia, Liguria, Tuscany, and North Africa, broke off communion with Pelagius. It was only under his successors, especially Gregory the Great and Sergius I, that these schisms were healed. Gaul and Spain also assumed a hostile attitude, but in these countries it never came to a formal schism.

[7] Mansi, 9, 367.
[8] Ibid. 9, 414 sqq.
[9] Ibid. 9, 457–488.
[10] Epist. Pelag. 3, 5, 9; P. L. 69.

Dogmatically these controversies are of interest only in so far as they have a bearing on the infallibility of General Councils and the Pope. And even in this respect they offer nothing that is of real importance. For it must be borne in mind that the writings of Theodore, Theodoret, and Ibas, or the so-called Three Chapters, might at the time of the controversy either be allowed to go uncensured or be condemned as heretical, without injury being done to the faith in either case. If due allowance was made for the time in which they originated, for the rather indefinite terminology which was then and there in vogue, and for the subjective good faith of the authors which was at least probable, there was no call for condemnation; and this was apparently the position taken by the Council of Chalcedon. But if, on the other hand, all these considerations were set aside, and the writings in question were judged exclusively on their own merit as they appeared in the light of a clearer and more definite terminology of later times, they could not well be passed by without severe censure; and this seems to have been the view taken of them by the Fifth General Council. Hence as far as these two Councils come in question, the matter of infallibility presents no difficulty; especially as Chalcedon did certainly not give a conciliar approval. And the same reasoning applies also to the action of Pelagius in accepting the condemnation of the Three Chapters by the Council of Constantinople.

The case of Vigilius offers greater difficulty. His *Judicatum* and his confirmation of the Council, on the one hand, and his *Constitutum,* on the other, seem certainly to give contradictory decisions, and yet they were meant to be binding on the whole Church. Of course, the case of Theodore may be eliminated, as his writings were consistently condemned all through and as the judgment regarding his person does not touch the faith. The difficulty, then, turns about the writings of Theodoret and Ibas. The *Judicatum* condemns them without discrimination, whilst the *Constitutum* cancels the sentence and anathematizes in a general way all writings against the true faith. But here it must not be overlooked that in his *Constitutum* Vigilius makes allowance for all the attenuating

circumstances enumerated above, taking the same position as the Council of Chalcedon, without passing any judgment on the objective merits or demerits of the writings in question. This alone would appear to remove all contradiction between the two documents in so far as they touch the question of Papal infallibility. And furthermore, it may reasonably be supposed that the *Constitutum* was not intended to give a definitive decision, but only to pass a disciplinary measure whereby respect for the Council of Chalcedon would be safeguarded. Thus whilst it is only too evident that Vigilius played an inglorious part throughout the whole proceeding, there is no evidence whatever that Papal infallibility was in any way compromised by his apparently contradictory decisions.

CHAPTER XXVIII

THE MONOTHELITE CONTROVERSY: THE SIXTH GENERAL COUNCIL[1]

The Council of Chalcedon defined the duality of natures in Christ, and reaffirmed the unity of person, declaring that both natures, the human and the divine, are "united in the one person of the Logos, without confusion and without change, without severance and without separation." This, if rightly understood, necessarily implies one subject of predication and a twofold principle of action — one Christ to whom, by reason of the hypostatic union, both human and divine actions are attributed, and two natures from each of which its own proper activity proceeds without interference from the other. Yet this latter doctrine, regarding the two distinct operations, was not explicitly and directly defined, and so there were not wanting those among orthodox Christians who favored one theandric or divinely human activity in Christ. There was no direct question of the acting principles themselves, but of their activity as proceeding from them and posited in its term. Logically, indeed, this confusion of activities should have led to a like confusion of principles, and so the Monophysites generally understood it; but orthodox writers, who favored one activity or operation in Christ, do not appear to have drawn this inference. Others, however, clearly perceived the implication, and resolutely defended two distinct operations as they were bound to defend two distinct natures. The result was a protracted controversy, which on the one side led to the definition of two wills and two operations by the Sixth General Council, and on the other to the Monothelite heresy.

[1] Cfr. Hefele, History of the Councils, V, 137–206; Tixeront, H. D. III, 153–179.

A — The Monothelite Controversy

The immediate occasion of the controversy was furnished by the Emperor Heraclius, who was anxious to conciliate the Monophysites of Syria and Egypt in his war against the Persians and Arabians. To gain over these heretics, he advanced the theory of one will in Christ as explained above, which was obviously a concession to their belief in the one nature. He was encouraged in this by Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople, who had been quietly advocating this view for some time past. The Emperor's first important convert was Cyrus of Phasis in Armenia, whom he transferred to the vacant patriarchate of Alexandria, with the understanding that he should gain over the Monophysites. The new patriarch was faithful to his commission and in a short time persuaded large bodies of the heretics to rejoin the Church. This reconciliation was effected on the basis of nine anathematisms, which emphasized that the union of the two natures in Christ was physical, that it resulted in one incarnate nature of the Logos, and that all those are anathema "who deny that there is one Christ and one Son, producing all His actions, divine and human, by one sole theandric operation, as is taught by St. Dionysius (the Pseudo-Areopagite), the elements of the union being so related that there is between them only a mental and not a real distinction." [2] All this is genuine Monophysism in phrase and expression, if not in thought and purpose.

The work of Cyrus was highly appreciated by the Emperor and the Patriarch of Constantinople, and by their assistance the reconciliation of heretics proceeded apace. But in 633, two Palestinian monks, Maximus and Sophronius, who were tarrying for a while in Alexandria, examined the Union Formula and immediately raised their voices in protest. This did not have much effect, but as Sophronius was the following year consecrated Patriarch of Jerusalem, his opposition became formidable. He wrote a long synodal letter, in which, after setting forth the orthodox Trinitarian and Christological doctrines as taught by the Church, he enlarges on the question

[2] Mansi, 2, 564–568.

of one will and operation in Christ. There is, he says, only one agent in the God-Man, one person, one subject of predication; but as there are two natures, and each nature preserves in the union its own perfections and properties, it follows necessarily that Christ has two wills, and where there are two wills there must be two operations ontologically distinct, although one nature does not act altogether independently of the other. Where there is only one operation, there can be only one nature; as it is from the distinction of operations that we infer, as philosophers have it, the distinction of natures.[3]

This protest made Sergius realize that his position would be untenable unless he could gain Rome over to his side. With this end in view, he sent a letter to Pope Honorius, giving an account of what was going on, and adding that since his conference with Sophronius he thought it better to observe a discreet silence on this matter, to which effect he had also written to Cyrus of Alexandria. It might easily happen, he thought, that people would be scandalized at the expression of one operation in Christ, although that was obviously the right doctrine, since two operations must lead to the assertion of two contrary wills, which would be against the teaching of the Fathers.

The suggestion of Sergius to observe a discreet silence was quite acceptable to Honorius, and he signified his acquiescence in two letters, one of which was written before he had received the synodal letter of Sophronius, and the other when he had examined that document. In the first letter the following points are deserving of notice, as they throw considerable light on the charges later on preferred against the author:

1°. One must avoid speaking about two operations in Christ; it is a mere question of words, which is apt to scandalize the simple. If we speak of two operations we are taken for Nestorians, if of one only we are believed to be Eutychians. Neither the Evangelists nor the Apostles nor the Councils say anything about one or two operations, but they tell us that there is one Jesus Christ who in His divinity and in His

[3] Mansi, II, 461–509; P. G. 87; Hefele, o. c. 43 sqq.

humanity acted in a multitude of different ways. Hence to decide whether it is proper to speak of one or two operations is not our business; that belongs to grammarians and philosophers to determine. Let us, therefore, keep quiet about it; or if anyone wishes to occupy himself with the question, let him beware of making his opinion a dogma of the faith.

2°. We must hold to this: Jesus Christ being one person, in a unique sense, has performed at diverse times divine works and human works, with the concurrence of both natures: the same Jesus acted in His two natures divinely and humanly.

3°. As regards the unity of will, it is obvious that one ought to acknowledge it; for although the Word took our nature, yet He did not take our vitiated nature: He took our flesh without the law of the flesh, which fights against the law of the spirit. Hence there was not in Christ a will of different tendencies, nor contrary to the law of the spirit; and if He said, "I am not come to do my will, but the will of the Father who sent me," or again, "not as I will but as thou wilt, my Father," that does not indicate a different will (from that of the Father), but only the economy of human nature which was assumed. These words were spoken for our instruction, so that we may imitate the example of the Master, each one of us preferring to his own will the will of God.[4]

In the second letter, of which only two fragments remain, Honorius quotes the famous passage in the *Epistola Dogmatica* of Leo, which clearly defines the two natures and their respective operations, but he insists that all such discussions should be avoided. Instead of one operation, as some contend, let us confess one Christ who acts in both natures; and instead of two operations, as others will have it, let us acknowledge two natures indivisibly and without confusion united in the Only-Begotten of the Father.[5]

But although Sergius had suggested that all parties should observe a discreet silence, he had no intention of doing so himself. In order to counteract the effect produced by the synodal letter of Sophronius, he composed a document known

[4] P. L. 40, 470–474. [5] Ibid. 474, 475.

as the *Ecthesis,* or Profession of Faith, which the Emperor signed and then sent around for subscription. Concerning the question under discussion he says: "Following in all things, and in this more particularly, the teaching of the holy Fathers, we confess in our Lord Jesus Christ, who is true God and true man, one only will; for at no time did His human nature, separately and of its own initiative, and against the assent of the Divine Word, with which it was hypostatically united, exercise its natural activity, but only when, in what manner, and to what extent, the Divine Word willed."[6] As Sophronius had meanwhile died, it was an easy matter to induce the Eastern bishops to subscribe the *Ecthesis,* especially as two successive synods held at Constantinople, the one under Sergius in 638, and the other under his successor Pyrrhus in 639, approved its doctrine.

Thus the East readily yielded to the wishes of the Emperor, but the West offered strong opposition. Honorius died in 638, and his successor Severinus survived the election only a few months. He was succeeded by John IV, who summoned a council to meet at Rome, for the purpose of taking decisive steps against the false teaching that was spreading in the East. The assembled bishops condemned the doctrine of one will as heretical, and notice of this was immediately sent to Constantinople. But meanwhile Heraclius had also died, leaving the government in the hands of his two sons, Heraclius and Heracleon. As soon as this became known at Rome, the Pope sent a letter to the new rulers, explaining the true doctrine and demanding the immediate suppression of the *Ecthesis.* In the same letter he also shows that Honorius did not deny two wills or two operations in Christ, but only two contrary wills and tendencies, in as much as the Word did not assume the law of the flesh which is radicated in our vitiated nature.[7]

This might have brought the dispute to a close, but before any results of the Pope's determined action could be looked for, Heraclius was assassinated and a little later his brother was first mutilated and then sent into exile. By this over-

[6] Mansi, 10, 992, 979. [7] Mansi, 10, 682–686; P. L. 80, 602–607.

throw of the government Constans II secured the throne, and he resented all interference from the West. A few years later he issued a *Typus,* or Statement, which enjoined strict silence on all parties concerning the matter under discussion. Pyrrhus, who seems to have been implicated in the political upheaval just referred to, fled to Africa and was succeeded by Paul as Patriarch of Constantinople.

Matters had, however, gone too far to be adjusted without a final decision on the part of the Church. Hence synods were held in many different places, all condemning the teaching of Sergius as an heretical innovation. Practically the whole West followed the lead of the Pope, whilst in Africa a famous discussion took place between the fugitive Pyrrhus and Abbot Maximus, wherein the latter proved the existence of two operations in Christ so conclusively that Pyrrhus owned himself vanquished and professed the true doctrine. This conference was followed by several synods which secured Africa for the orthodox view. When John IV died, his successor Theodore pursued the same policy. Paul of Constantinople having applied to him for confirmation of his election to the Patriarchal see, he demanded of him a clear profession of the orthodox faith in reference to the two operations, and when Paul in his answer advanced the views contained in the *Ecthesis,* the Pope promptly deposed him.

It was in this condition of things that Martin I ascended the Papal throne in 649. He had been legate at Constantinople and was thoroughly familiar with the cunning ways of the Greeks. Encouraged by Abbot Maximus, he made it his first care to convoke a synod, for the purpose of discussing ways and means of putting an end to the scandal of a divided episcopacy. Some 150 bishops were present, and during a whole month they subjected Monothelism to a thorough investigation. The result was a very decided condemnation of the doctrine of one will and one operation in Christ. A conciliar document was drawn up which contains the profession of faith as formulated by the Council of Chalcedon, and twenty anathematisms setting forth the true doctrine concerning the controverted points. As Christ had two natures, so had He

also two natural wills, and two natural operations, the divine and the human, which are predicated of one and the same person. The so-called theandric operation of the God-Man is not one action, partly human and partly divine, but comprises two distinct actions, the one divine and the other human, each originated by its own principle and both together indicating the marvelous union that was effected between the two natures. Hence Theodore of Pharas, Cyrus of Alexandria, Sergius, Pyrrhus, and Paul of Constantinople, all of whom taught the contrary doctrine, are condemned as heretics, whilst the *Ecthesis* and the *Typus* are rejected as utterly opposed to the true faith.[8]

As soon as this bold action of Martin became known to the Emperor, he had him arrested and banished to Chersonesus, where after many sufferings for the sake of orthodoxy the holy Pontiff died on September 16, 655. Abbot Maximus and two of his disciples, both called Anastasius, were also arrested and subjected to most cruel tortures, and then sent into banishment.

For more than a year the Roman clergy refused to elect a new Pope, but when they saw that the Emperor was going to appoint a Monothelite to the see of Rome, they chose Eugenius, who on the death of Martin became legitimate Pope. He sent two legates to Constantinople to come to an understanding with the Emperor, but they were imposed upon by Greek cunning and accepted three wills in Christ, two natural wills and one hypostatic. On their return to Rome they were very badly received; however as Eugenius died about that time, his successors Vitalian, Adeodat, and Donus, allowed the matter to rest. It was the next Pope, Agatho, who brought the long protracted dispute to a close.

B — The Sixth General Council

The Emperor Constans II died in 668, and was succeeded by Constantine IV, who was well disposed towards the cause of orthodoxy. Soon after Agatho's accession to the Papal throne, an understanding was reached which made provision

[8] Cfr. Hefele, l. c.

for the final settlement of the dispute. The Pope ordered synods to be held all through the West, and he himself held one at Rome, to give the orthodox doctrine its definite and permanent form. Immediately after the synods he drew up two letters to the Emperor, one in his own name and one in the name of the bishops of his patriarchate, the contents of the two being essentially the same.

In these letters he sets forth the faith of the Western Church in the form of a symbol, and when he comes to the matter in dispute he says: "When we confess in one and the same Lord Jesus Christ two natures, and two natural wills, and two natural operations, we do not say that they are contrary or opposed the one to the other, . . . nor, on the other hand, do we say that they are separate in two persons or two substances, but we mean that the same Lord Jesus Christ, as He has two natures, so has He also two natural wills and two natural operations, the one divine and the other human." [9]

As soon as the legates, who had been asked for, arrived at Constantinople, the Emperor summoned the bishops of the Patriarchates of Constantinople and Alexandria for a conference; but as the Patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem also sent their representatives, the final outcome of it was a general council. It was attended by 164 bishops, and lasted from November 7, 680, to September 16, 681. The Emperor himself presided, but only for the sake of honor, the doctrinal discussions being under the direction of the Papal legates, who also subscribed their names to the Acts before all the other members of the council.

As everyone was perfectly free to state his own views on the matter in question, a rather lively discussion ensued between the two parties. The leaders of the Monothelites were Macarius of Antioch, his disciple Stephen who was a monk, Peter of Nicomedia, and Solomon of Claneus. The Patriarch of Constantinople played a waiting game. The discussion was largely occupied with the examination of Patristic testimony, in which the orthodox party had decidedly the advantage, especially when it was found that the opposition had

[9] Mansi, 11, 234–286; P. L. 87, 1161–1213.

interpolated certain manuscripts in order to prove their point. However Macarius and Stephen would yield to no evidence, and so they were excommunicated. The dogmatic letters of Sergius to Cyrus and Honorius, and also Honorius' first letter to Sergius, were condemned as absolutely in disaccord with Apostolic teaching, with the decisions of Councils, and the doctrine of the holy Fathers. Several other documents, notably the second letter of Honorius to Sergius, were likewise declared to be stained with the same impiety. Finally, Sergius, Cyrus, Pyrrhus, Peter of Nicomedia, Paul of Constantinople, and Theodore of Pharas were anathematized, together with Honorius, who "was found in his writings to Sergius to have followed the latter's opinion, and to have confirmed his impious doctrines." [10]

The profession of faith drawn up by the Council is practically an adaptation of Agatho's letter to the Emperor, which, when it was read, was acclaimed by the assembled bishops with the words: "Peter has spoken through Agatho." The Emperor sanctioned all that was done, and Leo II, who had meanwhile succeeded Agatho, confirmed the council. He also anathematized, together with the Monothelites, "Honorius, who neglected to sanctify this Apostolic Church with the teaching of Apostolic tradition, but by profane treachery allowed its purity to be polluted." [11]

Thus the true doctrine was defined, which, when put into our modern terminology, comes to this: "According to orthodox teaching, personality is not an active principle, but in its concrete existence forms the subject of predication. The active principle in any and every person is his nature with its inherent faculties. Hence if in consequence of an hypostatic union there are two natures in a person, there must be two principles of action, each one of which has its own proper operation, though both operations are rightly and necessarily predicated of one and the same person."

It was in respect to this that Sergius and his followers fell into a fundamental error. They looked upon personality as an

[10] Mansi, II, 553–556. [11] Ibid. 753.

active principle, which operates physically in the nature it possesses as its own. This once assumed, the logical inference was that the human nature of Christ never acted spontaneously, of its own initiative, but was simply used as a physical instrument of the divinity. Thorough-going Monophysites would, of course, push their views still further, practically regarding the human faculties of the Saviour as absorbed by the divine energy. Sergius seems to have stopped short of this extreme view, admitting as he did that the human faculties remained distinct after the union of the two natures, but he asserted that the human nature of Christ had no initiative of its own, and could therefore act only in so far as it was moved by the all-powerful will of the Godhead. Hence the Council defined not merely the existence of a human will in Christ, but also the spontaneity of its natural operations.

A word or two must here be said about Honorius, whose case has been made much of by the adversaries of Papal infallibility. From the foregoing account it seems clear that the Sixth General Council condemned him as a heretic, and that Leo II associated him with the Monothelites. On the other hand, John IV stated expressly that Honorius did not teach the doctrine of one will or of one operation in Christ, and the same was also maintained by Abbot Maximus, who took a personal part in the discussions then going on. Hence whatever view one may take of the case, it would seem that either the Council or the Pope, or perhaps both fell into a dogmatic error.

Quite a number of solutions have been attempted, but most of them fail to convince. Some have maintained that the Acts of the Council are Greek forgeries, and that therefore Honorius was never condemned as a heretic. Others hold the Acts to be genuine, but contend that Honorius was condemned merely for negligence, because he was silent at the wrong time. Others, again, admit the genuineness of the Acts and also concede that Honorius was condemned for heresy, but maintain that the Council erred in a dogmatic fact, condemning an innocent man. This solution is admissible, since the council was neither presided over by the Pope in person nor had the

legates received definite instructions to bring about the condemnation of Honorius; hence if an error was committed, it was under conditions that do not warrant infallibility of teaching as inherent in a general council.

However a more satisfactory solution is suggested by Hefele, who holds that Honorius did not teach heresy and that his condemnation by the Council was not a dogmatic error. The first he shows from Honorius' own words, which contain the true doctrine but formulate it in misleading terms; the second he explains by pointing out that the Council was concerned only with the doctrine as expressed by the author, and in this sense it could rightly be condemned. Hence the council did not condemn the teaching of Honorius, but his unlucky expressions which were taken advantage of by the Monophysites. This may very well be maintained, especially as the Pope in his confirmation of the Council viewed the error of Honorius in this light. For he associated him with the Monothelites only in this sense, that he had "neglected to sanctify this Apostolic Church with the teaching of Apostolic tradition, but by profane treachery allowed its purity to be polluted." These words contain a severe censure, but they do not charge the unfortunate Honorius with positive heretical teaching.[12] It may be added that if he did teach error, it was only as a private individual and not in his capacity of Chief Shepherd; for in neither of his two letters does he speak *ex cathedra*.

[12] Cfr. Hefele, o. c. V, 49 sqq.

CHAPTER XXIX

CONTEMPORARY CHRISTOLOGY: ORTHODOX MARIOLOGY

From the account given in the preceding chapters of the various controversies that agitated the Christian world during the fifth, sixth, and seventh centuries, one is apt to carry away the impression that the Church's teaching on the points under discussion was vague and uncertain, at least so long as she was not called upon to give a final definition. Yet such an impression would be untrue to facts, although under the circumstances apparently well founded. Religious controversies are in the history of dogmas what wars are in the history of nations. If they are recorded at all, they at once seem to occupy the whole field of vision, causing one to forget that they are only abnormal incidents, unduly accentuating for a while the ambitious strivings of a few. They are manifestations of passion rather than of reason, or at best a manifestation of reason misguided in its quest after truth. Hence after recounting the story of the conflict, we must now briefly summarize the results achieved during times of peace; this alone can give us a correct view of the Church's position in reference to the points at issue.

A — Contemporary Christology

What the West thought of Christ during this period of conflict, what of the hypostatic union, and what of the consequences of that union, is sufficiently clear from the decisions concerning these matters given by Eastern councils. For these decisions were all dictated by the Popes, and the Popes on these occasions acted as spokesmen for the Western Church. The definition marked out for Ephesus by Celestine, for Chalcedon by Leo, for Constantinople by Agatho, embodied the

traditional teaching of the entire West on the points then under discussion. Always deeply conscious of its sacred heirloom received from the Apostolic past, the West struck a happy medium between the two extremes of Eastern theological speculations, represented respectively by the schools of Antioch and Alexandria. As a result, not only did the Western Church herself keep the faith intact, but with a strong hand also guided the East through all dangers of going astray, until a final decision was reached which made all further aberrations practically impossible.

But even before these authoritative decisions were given, individual theologians quite clearly presented the common teaching on the points in question. Thus John Cassian in his work entitled, *De Incarnatione Christi,* which was written at the request of the future Pope Leo I, anticipates all the definitions of Ephesus and Chalcedon. Mary is truly the Mother of God, in Christ there is only one person, that of the Word, but two distinct natures, the divine and the human, each one preserving in the union its own natural properties.[1] Fulgentius of Ruspe is equally clear, and emphasizes the fact that the union was established at the moment of conception, so that Mary is not the mother of the Godhead as such, nor of the humanity by itself, but of the Incarnate God.[2] The duality of natures in Christ brings with it the duality of wills and operations. This was pointed out by Leo in his letter to Flavian when the Monothelite controversy was still a matter of the future. The same was taught by other theologians of the time, as for instance by Maximus of Turin, who states quite definitely: "In one and the same Redeemer there are two distinct operations, of the divinity and of the humanity."[3] Whilst Agatho, in his letter which was accepted by the Sixth General Council, explains the doctrine in detail. In fact, all this was already fully understood by the Fathers of the fourth century, as has been pointed out in previous chapters.

During the time that the discussions with the East were going on, Boethius, though a philosopher rather than a theo-

[1] De Incarn. Christi, 2, 24; 5, 1; 6, 13, 22.
[2] Ep. 17, 7, 12.
[3] Serm. 117.

logian, endeavored to bring about a better understanding by a proper definition of terms. He gave the Latin equivalents of *οὐσία*, *ὑποστάσις*, and *πρόσωπον*, as nature, substance, and person.[4] His definitions of nature and person have become classical. According to him, nature is that which constitutes the specific difference of things: "Natura est unamquamque rem informans specifica differentia;"[5] whilst a person is the individually existing substance of rational nature: "Persona est naturae rationalis individua substantia."[6] Cassiodorus, his contemporary, gives a somewhat similar definition, understanding by person a rational and individually existing substance, distinguished by its own properties from others of its kind: "Persona hominis est substantia rationalis, individua, suis proprietatibus a consubstantialibus caeteris segregata."[7]

Theological writers of the East, even whilst defending the same doctrines, showed less agreement in the manner of presenting and explaining their views. This, as has already been pointed out, was owing to the difference of viewpoints of the theological schools of Antioch and Alexandria. Both schools as such were perfectly orthodox, although in either the one or the other all the chief heretics of the time had received their training. The best representative of the Alexandrian school was Cyril, who championed the cause of orthodoxy against Nestorius. Although handicapped by an imperfect terminology, he almost rivaled Leo in depth of thought and precision of doctrine. His Christological views have been given in connection with the Council of Ephesus, and need not be repeated here. Of the Antiochene school we have a fair representative in Theodoret of Cyrus, the ablest opponent of Cyril in the Nestorian controversy. A few remarks on his Christological teaching will be in place.

He starts out with the assumption that before the union there was only one nature, the divine nature of the Word. The human nature of Christ never existed apart; it was in its very production united to the Godhead, and hence it never was a

[4] Cont. Eutych. et Nest. 3.
[5] Ibid. 1.
[6] Ibid. 3.
[7] In Ps. 7.

human person.[8] After the union there were in Christ two natures, the nature assumed and the nature assuming, of which, however, he frequently speaks as if they were two persons as well.[9] Bardenhewer and others maintain that in his earlier writings against Cyril, Theodoret defended the Nestorian thesis of a double hypostasis in Christ; but it would perhaps be truer to say that Theodoret did not interpret the Nestorian thesis as postulating a double hypostasis at all. If it is true, as is held by many, that he was the author of the Union Creed, this conclusion becomes unavoidable. For at the time he was still a friend of Nestorius, and yet the unity of person in Christ as well as the divine motherhood of Mary are quite clearly brought out in the Creed thus ascribed to him. And even if he was not its author, he certainly accepted it as his own profession of faith. It is true, his writings were later on condemned by the Fifth General Council; but that does not necessarily mean that he was heterodox in so far as his own subjective faith came in question. They were condemned only in their obvious sense, which, owing to the author's faulty way of expressing himself, was sufficiently at variance with orthodox teaching to call for condemnation, as will appear from the following paragraphs.

In the union, according to Theodoret, each nature preserves its own properties and natural mode of action; but there is between them a conjunction, an indwelling, and intimate union, which, indeed is a matter of complacency and grace, but it is not merely a moral union; it is physical in such wise that Christ is only one person and one incarnate Son of God.[10] This is, however, the weakest part of his teaching, and gave the greatest offense to his orthodox opponents. Whilst he rejects the purely sympathetic and mechanical union advocated by Nestorius, he seems ever afraid of making it too close. This is partly owing to the traditions of his school, and partly also to his dread of Apollinarianism, which he thought was lurking under the terms used by Cyril.

He admits the necessary consequences of such a union, the

[8] Eranist. 2.
[9] Ibid. De Incarn. Dom. 18.
[10] Eranist. 2.

communicatio idiomatum and the Divine Motherhood of the Virgin, though always with some reserve. Thus Mary is truly Theotokos, Mother of God, as she "is called by the masters of piety," yet he points out that by the same "masters of piety" she is also termed "Mother of man." [11] If she bore the Word of God incarnate in human nature, she likewise bore the man who had been assumed by the Word. Nor was Cyril justified in ascribing sufferings and death to the Word of God. It was not God who was crucified; but the man Jesus Christ, who was of the seed of David, the son of Abraham.[12] This apparent inconsistency, which admitted a real union and yet hesitated to recognize all its consequences, may perhaps partly be ascribed to a misunderstanding of Cyril's teaching. When Cyril attributed the death of the cross to the Incarnate Word of God, Theodoret seems to have understood this as referring to the divine nature in itself, which was at best a blundering misconception.

There are two other writers belonging to this period, though not so directly connected with either school, who deserve special mention. The first of these is Leontius of Byzantium, who wrote in the early part of the sixth century. Cardinal Mai, who first edited most of his works in the original Greek, declared him to be the foremost theologian of his epoch. He is the author of three books against the Nestorians and Eutychians, in the preface of which he says: "I shall demonstrate the thesis that the nature of the divinity of Christ and the nature of His humanity existed and continued to exist after the union: afterwards I shall treat of the mutual relations of these two natures and their modes of existence"; both of which, says Bardenhewer, he has done in an admirable manner.[13]

He begins with a definition of terms, in which he largely utilizes the Categories of Aristotle. As regards the suppositum or person, he follows the teaching of the Cappado-

[11] De Incarn. 35.

[12] Serm. fragm. P. G. 84, 62.

[13] The following summary of the Christology of Leontius and Maximus has in part been taken from the account given by Tixeront, H. D. III, 145–153, 180–185.

cians, indentifying it simply with the individual nature in so far as it exists apart, independently, and in consequnece being *sui juris*. Hence he writes: "Nature implies the idea of being simply, but hypostasis the further idea of being apart; the former indicates the species, the latter bears reference to the individual; the former connotes the universal, the latter separates the proper from the common. Hence the notion of hypostasis is realized only in beings that are identical in nature but numerically distinct, or in such as result from different natures that have an hypostasis in common." A person, therefore, is a complete nature existing independently, not united to a whole of which it is a constituent part in any sense.

After this definition of terms, he proceeds to consider the human nature of Christ. As every individual nature must in some way be completed by an hypostasis, Christ's human nature also demands this complement; yet it does not exist apart, independently; it has no hypostasis of its own, and as such it is not "ὑπόστατος": still it exists, and therefore it is not "ἀνυπόστατος," which would make it a mere abstraction; but it exists in the Word, it is completed by the hypostasis of the Word, and in consequence it is "ἐνυπόστατος."

But is such an inexistence possible? The author adduces several analogous examples, which in some way illustrate the mystery. Thus the specifying and individuating notes have a somewhat similar inexistence, as on the one hand they are not simple accidents, and on the other they are not parts of subsisting natures. Something similar, again, we see in the human compositum, where soul and body constitute a whole, yet retain their own nature. Of course, these are only examples, and must not be pushed too far in their application. They illustrate to some extent, but do not explain the mystery.

Now this view of the matter excludes both the Nestorian and the Eutychian heresy. For although the Word assumed a complete and perfect nature, yet that nature does not exist apart, is not *sui juris;* it is but a part of the whole, and therefore not a person: hence Christ is only one person, the person of the Word, having two natures. On the other hand, as the

followers of Eutyches admit that the specific characteristics of human nature are in Christ, they are forced to admit that human nature itself is also there, since the two are inseparable; and consequently they must confess that Christ has two natures, although He is only one person.

True, the union of soul and body, which had been used as an illustration, results in one nature; but this is owing to their innate relation to one another, whereby they constitute a species that admits of several individuals. The same result cannot have place in the union of human nature with the person of the Word. In this union both elements are complete, and so the result of the union cannot be a new nature — a nature divinely human, which would make Christ a species instead of an individual.

To the objection of Severus, one of the Monophysite leaders, that if two natures be admitted, two operations must also be admitted, and this in its turn must lead to the admission of two persons in Christ, he replies: "The distinction of the natures does indeed imply the distinction of operations, since operation is, after all, only nature in action; but this in no way interferes with the unity of person. It is not the distinction of the natures, whether in action or otherwise, but their separation that divides the person."

In all this the Byzantine philosophizing theologian is certainly orthodox, and if at times, in other connections, he seems to speak against the Council of Chalcedon, it is not because of the doctrine that was there proposed, but rather because of the terms in which that doctrine was defined. All in all, he did yeoman's service in the cause of orthodox Christology, and paved the way for many a subtile distinction of the Scholastic age.

The second theologian who deserves special mention in this connection is Abbot Maximus. He was to the seventh century what Leontius was to the sixth, but he approaches more closely to the Western concept of Christological teaching. This may be accounted for by his long stay in the West and his intimate association with John IV and Martin I in their struggles

against Monothelism. He was both a mystic and a dogmatic theologian, and his writings were much appreciated for many centuries after his death.

In his theological discussions he makes free use of the technique and definitions of Aristotle, and thus he may be accounted as one of the earliest Scholastics. "The God-Man is always the center of his dogmatic teachings. The Logos is for him the origin and end of all created beings. The history of the world develops along two great lines: the first is the Incarnation of God predestined from the beginning and accomplished historically in the fullness of time; the second is the deification of man that begins with the Incarnation of God and will be finally accomplished through the restoration of the divine image in man. As the beginning of the new life and the second Adam, Christ is necessarily true God and perfect man. The difference of the natures in Christ does not imply a division of personality, nor does the unity of the latter imply a commingling of the natures. On the contrary, given two whole and perfect natures, there must be also two wills and two natural activities or energies." [14] Hence whilst there is one person in Christ, there are two natures and two operations, the latter naturally resulting from the two distinct wills.

This leads him to speak of the nature of activity. Some sort of activity is essential to every existing being; a being without any sort of activity is simply a nonentity. Now this essential activity always corresponds to the nature of the being whose activity it is, and it is proximately by their activities that beings are distinguished from one another. Its principle or source is nature in the concrete, not personality as such, although personality imparts to it its moral value. Hence it will not do to say that Christ's human nature is so subordinated to the divine that it is a mere instrument which has no activity of its own. This would be to destroy His human nature as Apollinaris did. Nor will it do to call His human nature a merely extrinsic instrument, for that would be to divide His person as was done by Nestorius.

It is true, Cyril speaks of "one connatural energy," but this

[14] Cfr. Bardenhewer, Patrol. 578, 579.

expression he uses in reference to a particular case, as when Christ by His omnipotence worked a miracle with the concurrence of His human nature. His hands touched the sick person, and His omnipotent power restored him to health. It was morally one action, yet physically it was made up of two distinct activities. In a somewhat similar sense does the Areopagite say that because of the union of the two natures in Christ there results "a certain new theandric energy"; for by this he only points to the circuminsession of the two natures, which, although they have each their own proper activity, yet by reason of their intimate union and perfect harmony act as one.

However the presence of a twofold activity in Christ does not imply that the human nature is in its actions altogether independent of the divine. In itself the human will is vacillating and imperfect, because of the limitations of the human intellect which serves it as a guide. In order to make it firm in the pursuance of good, it must be illumined by a perfect knowledge, which comes to it through the union with the Word. Moreover, although the will in itself is essential to a perfect nature, its manner of acting is under the direction of the person; and in so far the human will of Christ was directed by His divine will. Hence Christ had indeed a free human will, but not one that was impaired by human defects. This is the only difference between His human will and ours. Whilst our will can always lapse into sin, His could not; it was a perfect will as demanded by the hypostatic union. For by reason of this every act of the human will in Christ is attributable to the person of the Word.

All this reasoning, which is purely and eminently Scholastic, the author supports by copious citations from Holy Scripture and the writings of the early Fathers. In this, too, he was a worthy forerunner of the Angel of the Schools.

B — Orthodox Mariology

Here seems to be the best place for gathering together the teaching of the Fathers concerning the Blessed Mother of God. In this as well as in their teaching on Christ, there is

noticeable a constant development, which received a new impulse from the definition of her Divine Motherhood by the Council of Ephesus. Whilst the bishops, gathered in that solemn assembly, voiced the faith of the past, they at the same time offered fresh incentive to the pious veneration of the future. Hence taking our stand at the Council, we may at once look backward and forward and so observe at a glance what development there was in Mariological teaching from Nicæa to the end of the Patristic age.

As was pointed out in the general summary of Antenicene theology, the Divine Motherhood of Mary and her close association with the Saviour in the work of redemption were universally accepted as a matter of orthodox belief during the first three centuries of the Christian era. Justin, Irenæus, and Tertullian spoke of her as the cause of our salvation and our advocate with God. To them she was the sinless Virgin, who by her obedience restored what had been ruined by the disobedience of Eve. There is little in the line of records from which it might be inferred that she was made the object of a special religious veneration by the faithful of those early times, but we know that her place in orthodox theology was already clearly defined.

The Fathers of the fourth century adopted the views of their predecessors, and developed them as occasion required. Those of the East defended her Divine Motherhood against the Arians, and her perpetual virginity against the Antidicomarianites. "The Word that was from all eternity born of the Father," says Athanasius, "the same was in time born of the Virgin, the Mother of God." [15] "If any one does not believe that Holy Mary is the Mother of God," writes Gregory of Nazianzus, "he is separated from the Divinity." [16] Epiphanius calls her "Virgo in partu et post partum," [17] and in another place he asks: "What man ever was there at any time, who presumed to mention the name of Holy Mary and did not immediately add, Virgin? . . . Thus the title of virgin was given to Holy Mary, nor shall it ever be changed; for this

[15] De Incarn. 8.
[16] Ep. 101.
[17] Adv. Haer. 88, 18.

holy one remained incorrupt." [18] Didymus speaks of her as "ever Virgin, always and in all things Virgin undefiled." [19] Similar terms were used by Amphilochius, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and others; whilst some among the faithful, who had more zeal than discretion, formed at this time a special sect, called the Collyridians, who went so far as to offer sacrifices to her as if she were a goddess. These, of course, were disowned by the Church.

Among the Eastern Fathers of this period it was especially St. Ephrem of Nisibis in Syria who sang her praises in most eloquent strains. "O Thou Virgin Lady," he addresses her, "Thou Immaculate Mother of God, my most glorious Mistress, most generously kind, Thou art higher than the heavens, much purer than the resplendent rays and brightness of the sun. . . . Thou art the fruitful rod of Aaron, Thou didst appear as the true Virgin, and the flower Thou bearest is truly Thy Son our Christ, my God and my Maker; Thou didst bring forth God the Word according to the flesh, keeping Thy virginity unstained before His birth, and after His birth Thou didst remain a virgin." [20] And in another place, addressing the Saviour, he says: "Indeed, Thou and Thy Mother are the only ones who are altogether beautiful; for in Thee, O Lord, there is no sin, and in Thy Mother there is no stain. But my children are in no wise like unto these two examples of perfect beauty." [21] This evidently implies the Immaculate Conception, although the author may not have had the idea clearly in his mind.

As regards her freedom from even the slightest personal faults, there seems to have been some difference of opinion among the fourth-century writers in the East. Whilst the majority extol her holiness without reference to anything reprehensible either in her character or conduct, Chrysostom thinks that she was moved by vanity when at the marriage feast in Cana she asked her Son to provide the necessary wine; [22] and that, when she wished to speak to Jesus whilst He was ad-

[18] Ibid. 78, 6.
[19] De Trin. 1, 27.
[20] Orat. ad Sanct. Dei Matrem.
[21] Carm. Nisib. 27, 8.
[22] In Joan. 21.

dressing the multitude, she was guilty of imperiousness.[23] Similarly Basil and Cyril of Alexandria, who interpret the prophecy of Simeon as implying that Mary was moved by a doubt in the divinity of Jesus whilst she was standing under the Cross.[24] But these are exceptions that do not effect the common view that Mary's holiness was in every way perfect.

The Western writers are equally definite when speaking of Mary's position in the economy of salvation, and of her unexampled holiness and prerogatives. "O wonderful mystery," exclaims Zeno, "Mary conceived as an undefiled virgin, as a virgin she brought forth her child, and a virgin she remained after His birth." [25] Her praises were especially celebrated by Ambrose, who pointed to her as the "Virginitatis Magistra." "Exalted therefore is Mary, who unfurled the banner of holy virginity, and raised the standard of undefiled integrity. . . . Non deficit Maria, non deficit virginitatis magistra." [26] In another place he seems to allude to her immaculate conception; for addressing Christ, he says: "Receive me in the flesh which has fallen in Adam. Receive me not from Sara, but from Mary; that she may be an undefiled virgin, but a virgin through grace, free from all stain of sin." [27]

Mary's prerogative of perpetual virginity was also staunchly defended by Jerome, who wrote against Helvidius and Jovinian. Both resuscitated the singular and forgotten opinion of Tertullian, that Mary had lost her virginity in the birth of Christ. Helvidius furthermore contended that she had become the mother of other children, to whom Holy Scripture refers as the brothers and sisters of Jesus. In refuting these heretics, Jerome rejected the authority of Tertullian as of one who did not belong to the Church, gave an orthodox interpretation of the pertinent Scripture texts, based upon the Jewish custom of applying the terms brother and sister to near relations, and then summed up the traditional teaching on the subject in the terse sentence: "That God was born of a virgin we believe, because this we read; that Mary ceased to be a virgin after

[23] In Matt. 44, 1.
[24] Ep. 259; In Joan. 19, 25.
[25] Tract. 2, 8, 2.
[26] De Instit. Virg. 35, 45.
[27] In Ps. 118, 22, 30.

the birth of her Son, we do not believe, because this we do not read." [28]

St. Augustine, too, always speaks of the Mother of God with the greatest reverence, and in one striking passage brings out her absolute sinlessness. "When there is question of sin," he writes, "I do not wish to have the Virgin Mary so much as mentioned, out of respect for the Lord." [29] Because the Son is without sin, therefore the Mother must also be without sin. This statement many theologians interpret as a declaration of Mary's immaculate conception; and although the text is directly concerned only with actual or personal sins, the interpretation may well stand. For in another place the author lays down the rule that no one can be free from personal sin unless he was preserved from the original stain.[30] It is true, in the same text he actually exempts only Christ from having incurred the sin of Adam; but it may well be that in this he pointed to Christ's inherent right to be so preserved. Christ had a right to be immune from original sin; Mary was immune from it through grace. That this distinction was in the author's mind, may be inferred from another text. For when Julian of Eclanum accused him of involving Mary herself in guilt by his theory of original sin, he replied: "We do not transfer Mary to the devil's book owing to the law of birth; but the reason we do not, is that this law is broken by the grace of being born again." [31] This reply has really no sense except on the supposition that Augustine meant to assert Mary's preservation from original sin.

It can indeed not be denied that there are other texts in Augustine's writings, which seem to imply that in his view Mary had incurred the common guilt. Thus in one place he sets up the general principle, that exemption from original sin presupposes a virginal birth in the person so exempted.[32] He also calls Mary's body simply a body of sin, whereas he speaks of the body of her Son as being in the likeness of a body of sin.[33] But in view of what was said in the preceding para-

[28] Advers. Helvid. 19.
[29] De Nat. et Grat. 42.
[30] Cont. Jul. 5, 15, 57.
[31] Opus Imperf. Cont. Jul. 4, 122.
[32] Cont. Jul. 5, 52.
[33] Cont. Jul. Opus Imperf. 4, 79; 6, 22.

graph, it is more than likely that in these and similar passages the author had in mind only the general law according to which original sin is transmitted; leaving aside for the moment all consideration of what might be effected by a special grace of God. Hence it would seem that Augustine may reasonably be appealed to as an authority for the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. And for the rest also he is very explicit in extolling Mary's sanctity.

However, whilst the Mother of God thus occupied a prominent place in the love and veneration of the faithful, there are no records of any feasts having been celebrated in her honor during the fourth century. Etheria or Silvia, in her *Peregrinatio,* makes indeed mention of the Presentation in the Temple, which was celebrated during her stay in Jerusalem in 360, but she does not associate it with the Blessed Virgin. As gathered from her narrative, it commemorated the presentation of the child Jesus forty days after His birth, and occurred on the 14th of February, Epiphany then still holding the place of Christmas. On the other hand, even at that early date many churches were dedicated to the Mother of God, as among others was the church at Ephesus, " Holy Mary," in which the Third General Council was held. Her images, too, were in use among the faithful, as we learn from recent discoveries in the catacombs; but whether religious veneration was paid to them is not so certain.

Such, then, was the place which the Virgin Mary held in the hearts of the faithful and in the teaching of the Church when the Council of Ephesus officially declared her to be truly the Mother of God. From that time forward devotion to her became even more intense and widespread. The splendid encomiums pronounced on her virtues and privileges by Cyril of Alexandria found an echo in all subsequent ages. Not only her perpetual virginity, but also her absolute sinlessness was universally accepted as necessarily implied in her dignity of Divine Motherhood. And this sinlessness, at least as interpreted in the East, was understood to imply also immunity from the original stain. It is true, this is nowhere stated in so many words, but the terms used by the writers subsequent

to the Council of Ephesus can hardly mean anything less. Hers, they say, is a holiness so complete that it admits of no stain, so great that it places her above the Apostles and the angels, so altogether singular that it makes her a worthy Mediatrix between heaven and earth. Whatever a purely human being can receive from the hand of God, that is found in Mary. This, however, was not so universally held by Western writers. They also extolled Mary's sanctity and reverenced her with loving devotion; but many of them seem to have stopped short of believing her immune from original sin. In fact, Fulgentius states openly that she was conceived in sin as the rest of mankind; and similar expressions are found in the writings of Ferrandus, Leo I, Gregory I, and Venerable Bede.[34] They were close followers of Augustine, and it seems that they interpreted him in this sense.

It is also after the Council of Ephesus that we first find records of feasts being celebrated in honor of the Mother of God. The second Trullan synod, or the Quinisext, held in 692, refers to the Annunciation as a well known festival of our Lady. The feast of the Presentation originated probably in Jerusalem early in the sixth century; whilst the feast of the Visitation, according to some modern authors, dates from the bringing of the Virgin's veil to the Blachernæ monastery near Constantinople in 478. The Dormition of the Mother of God, or Mary's Assumption, which the Emperor Maurice had transferred from the 18th of January to the 15th of August, probably reaches back as far as the fifth century, since belief in Mary's bodily assumption into heaven was then spreading rapidly both in the East and the West.[35] Mary's Nativity also, commemorated

[34] Cfr. Tixeront, o. c. III, 409.

[35] That the traditional belief in Mary's bodily assumption into heaven reaches back to the earliest Christian centuries is very likely; but there is no direct historical evidence to prove it. St. John Damascene in his three homilies on the Dormitio represents this belief as an ancient heirloom, and he declares that his sole purpose in preaching on the Assumption of the Mother of God is to develop and establish what in a brief and almost too concise a manner the son has inherited from the father, according to the common saying (Hom. 2, 4). Yet, on the other hand, St. Epiphanius, in the second half of the fourth century, seems to have been unaware of the existence of such a belief; for he declares that he does not know whether the Holy Virgin died at

on the 8th of September, was a well known festival in the seventh century. Finally the feast of Mary's Conception, which the Greeks celebrate on the 9th of December, was observed in some Eastern churches from the beginning of the seventh century onwards. All of these festivals had their origin in the East; but, with the exception of the last one, they were almost immediately adopted in the West, an evident sign that both Churches were at one in their reverence for the Mother of God.

And this brings the development of Mariology practically to a close. Many new feasts have since been introduced, and a variety of special devotions have been originated; but they have contributed little to the further development of Patristic teaching in this respect. Only the long continued discussion of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception during the Middle Ages, and its final definition by Pius IX in the last century, marked a forward step; although even this forward step had been well prepared for by the Fathers of old.

all, or was buried (De Haer. 78, 11). About a century later, the Pseudo-Areopagite gave currency to the legend that the Apostles opened the tomb of the Virgin some days after her burial, and instead of her body they found therein the most fragrant lilies (De Div. Nom. 3, 2). However as his writings were almost immediately rejected as apocryphal, they can have had little to do with the growing belief in Mary's Assumption.

The first undoubted testimony to the firmly established belief in the Assumption is a statement of Gregory of Tours, who died in 596. He writes: "The Lord commanded the holy body to be borne in a cloud to paradise, where, reunited to its soul, and exulting with the elect, it enjoys the never ending bliss of eternity" (Mirac. 1, 4; P. L. 71, 708). Of the same tenor is a prayer found in the Gregorian Sacramentary, which dates probably from the beginning of the seventh century. It runs thus: "Today's festival is venerable to us, O Lord, because on this day the Blessed Mother of God suffered temporal death, but it was not possible that she who gave birth to our Incarnate Lord, Thy Son, should be subjugated by death" (P. L. 88, 133). From this time on references to the fact of the Assumption and to the celebration of the feast become quite numerous.

The dogmatic reason underlying the belief in Mary's bodily Assumption into heaven is thus stated by St. Germanus of Constantinople, who died in 733: "Thou hast obtained the honorable title of Mother of God, . . . therefore it was becoming that thy body, which had received into itself the Life, should not be enshrouded in death by corruption (Orat. in Dormit. B. Mariae, 2; P. G. 98, 359). Another reason is, of course, contained in Mary's immaculate conception and perpetual virginity.

CHAPTER XXX

THE VENERATION OF THE SAINTS: THE DOCTRINE OF PURGATORY: ESCHATOLOGICAL VIEWS[1]

As is sufficiently evident from what has been said in the preceding chapters, the dissensions of heretics gave a strong impulse to the development of orthodox teaching in reference to points of doctrine which they called in question. However development took place also along other lines, independently of all controversy. The Holy Spirit is ever active in the Church of Christ, guiding her not only in her official decisions and formal definitions, but also in the faithful discharge of her ordinary duties, whether it be the preaching of God's word or the promoting of divine worship. In all this she clings to the traditions of the past, yet without overlooking the needs of the present. She ever preaches what the Apostles preached, and she ever worships what the Apostles worshiped; but in this preaching and worshiping she emphasizes now one point or feature and then another, as best suits the circumstances of time and place. Sometimes the initiative in this matter is taken by the head of the Church, but oftener by some individual bishop or priest, moved thereto not rarely by members of the flock; for the Spirit breatheth wheresoever He listeth. The result of this shows itself in the gradual fixation of the doctrines or features of worship thus emphasized, and so the work of development is promoted in God's own quiet way. To the doctrines thus gradually developed belong the three placed at the head of the present chapter.

A — The Veneration of the Saints

In one sense the practice of venerating the saints of God is

[1] Cfr. McGinnis, The Communion of Saints; Kirsch, The Doctrine of the Communion of Saints; Atzberger, Eschatologie; Duchesne, Christian Worship.

as old as the Church; for from the very beginning of Christianity religious reverence was shown to the martyrs of the faith, and prayers were offered to obtain their intercession with God. It was altogether distinct from divine worship as such, even as it is distinct from it now, both in object and purpose; but it was truly of a religious nature and found its proper place near the altar of sacrifice. "Christ," wrote the church of Smyrna, in the early part of the second century, "we adore as the Son of God, but the martyrs we rightly love as the disciples and imitators of the Lord." Their bones are reverently gathered up, "as being more precious than gems," and deposited "in a decent place, where the faithful may come together for the purpose of celebrating the anniversary of the martyr's death, both in memory of those who have triumphed in the conflict and that their successors may be ready and prepared to bear the same trials." [2]

This contains at once a record of the practice then in vogue, an explanation of the veneration paid to martyrs, a statement of the reasons upon which it is based, and a reference to the purpose it was meant to subserve. The martyrs, it is stated, are not worshiped as gods, but venerated as the dear friends of God; and this is right and just, because here on earth they were the disciples and imitators of the Lord; nor is this useless, for it contributes to their honor and helps others to follow their example.— Here we have a complete and exact exposition of the theological aspect of the veneration of Saints.

These same views were frequently touched upon by the writers of the fourth and fifth centuries. "Whoever honors God," says Epiphanius, "honors the saint; whoever despises the saint, despises the Lord of the saints." [3] "They have great power with God," Chrysostom tells his hearers, and Gregory of Nazianzus adds: "Much greater than when they were still on earth." [4] The Latin writers were entirely of the same mind; hence Jerome states: "We honor the relics of the martyrs that thereby we may adore Him whose martyrs they are. We honor the servants, so that their honor may

[2] Martyr. Polyc. 17.
[3] Adv. Haer. 18, 21.
[4] De S. Melitio, Orat. 18, 21.

redound to the honor of the Lord." [5] And to this there is no exception among orthodox theologians, either in the fourth or any subsequent century.

However in the beginning this veneration was almost exclusively paid to the martyrs of the faith. Moreover this *cultus* remained for a long time more or less local, each community honoring its own martyred heroes. Gradually, however, a commemoration was also made of all the holy martyrs in general, as appears from a homily of Maximus of Turin, which was written about the middle of the fifth century. But he still emphasizes the propriety of first and especially honoring the martyrs belonging to his own particular church; for he says: "As we must celebrate the general commemoration of all the holy martyrs, so, my brethren, ought we to celebrate with special devotion the feasts of those who shed their blood in our own locality. For while all the saints, wherever they may be, assist us all, yet those who suffered in our midst intercede for us in a special manner. And the reason is that the martyr suffers not for himself alone, but also for his fellow citizens. By his sufferings he obtains rest for himself and salvation for them." [6] It was only when the Teuton nations, who as yet had no martyrs of their own, were converted to the faith, that the restriction of festivals to local saints was gradually removed.

The earliest records of the public veneration of saints who were not martyrs, aside from the Blessed Virgin, date back to the beginning of the sixth century. About that time a church was dedicated in Rome to Pope Sylvester and Martin of Tours.[7] Thereafter the custom spread rapidly, and feasts were instituted of virgins and confessors as well as of martyrs. The principle involved is, of course, the same in both cases. Any one, whether a martyr or not, who is with God in heaven, is by that very fact deserving of veneration. But whether the Church will think it expedient to accord him public veneration is another matter. This rests with her. It is true, in olden times there was no formal process of canonization;

[5] Ep. 109, 1.
[6] Hom. 81, P. L. 57, 427.
[7] Cfr. Kellner, Heortology, 208.

the veneration of deceased holy persons usually grew up spontaneously among the faithful, and was then accepted by the bishop of the diocese or by a local synod: but this does not alter the case; the final decision always rests with the Church. However she never issued a prohibition which stood in the way of paying public veneration to those of her sainted children who were not martyrs; but she accommodated herself to the exigencies of the times. The memories of the terrible years of conflict still lingered in the minds of the faithful, and when in consequence they restricted their veneration to the martyred heroes of the faith, she did not interfere. But when with the lapse of time the proper moment arrived, she had no misgivings about according the honors of her altars to confessors and virgins as well as to the martyrs of old. She laid down only two conditions: that the sanctity of the person in question be beyond suspicion, and that the example of his or her life be an inspiration for good to the faithful.

B — The Doctrine of Purgatory

The Catholic doctrine of purgatory comprises two points: First, that there is a place of purgation, where the souls of the departed that are still stained by slight sins, or at least have not yet completely satisfied the justice of God, are subjected to some kind of purifying process until they are worthy to be admitted to the blessed vision of God; secondly, that while detained in this place they may be assisted by the suffrages of the faithful here on earth. Under both aspects the doctrine is met with in the writings of the earliest times. Thus Origen knows of a place in the lower regions where souls are purified by a baptism of fire;[8] and Tertullian states that the prison-house of which the Gospel speaks is a subterranean place in which souls are detained, and that the last farthing, which must be paid before deliverance is possible, stands for slight faults of which these souls must be cleansed before they are fit for the resurrection;[9] whilst Cyprian and others speak of the Holy Sacrifice being offered for the dead as a general custom.

[8] In Luc. Hom. 24.

[9] De Anima, 58.

However it was chiefly during the fourth and fifth centuries that this doctrine was fully developed. Thus St. Basil states quite clearly, that souls are judged immediately after death, "so that, if they are found to be still disfigured by the wounds of the conflict, or to have retained any stains or vestiges of sins, their reward may be delayed for a while; and, if on the other hand, they are found to be without wounds or stains, that they may, unconquered and free, rest with Christ." [10] Gregory of Nyssa uses almost the same terms, and then announces the general principle: "No one can see God unless the purgatorial fire has cleansed his soul from all stains." [11] This principle was admitted by all, and from it, in view of human weakness, they necessarily inferred the existence of purgatory, although they also deduced it from the teaching of Holy Scripture.

Belief in the efficacy of suffrages for the departed was equally firm and widespread. A commemoration of the dead was universally made during the Holy Sacrifice, as is thus stated by St. Cyril of Jerusalem: "Afterwards we make a commemoration also of those who have slept in the Lord: first of the Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, and martyrs, so that through their supplications and intercession God may receive our prayer; then for the deceased holy fathers and bishops, and for all in general who have departed this life, believing that this is of the greatest help for those souls for whom prayer is offered whilst the holy and tremendous Victim lies upon the altar." [12] And for this Ephrem, the Syrian, also pleads in his last will: "On the thirtieth day, my brethren, make a commemoration of me. For the dead are helped by the sacrifice which is offered by the living." [13] And a little further on: "If the men of Mathathias, who were entrusted with the offering of sacrifices, could expiate, as you have read, by their oblations the sins of the fallen soldiers, how much more are the priests of God's own Son able to expiate by their Holy Sacrifice and by the prayers of their lips the sins of the dead!" [14]

[10] In Ps. I, Hom. 4.
[11] Orat. De Mortuis.
[12] Catech. Mystag. 5, 9, 10.
[13] Testam. 72.
[14] Ibid. 78.

This doctrine the fourth century writers had sometimes to defend against the followers of Aërius, who formed an extreme section of the Arian party. These sectaries contended that suffrages for the dead were useless, and to pray for them or offer the Holy Sacrifice in their behalf was folly. In answer to them Epiphanius writes: "Even though it does not blot out all sins, the prayer made for the departed is profitable to them; for while we are in this world, it often happens that willingly or unwillingly we waver in choosing what is more perfect." [15] Chrysostom traces the custom of offering suffrages for the dead to the Apostles themselves. "It is not in vain," he writes, "that the Apostles established this law, that in the venerable and tremendous Mysteries a commemoration should be made of those who have departed this life. For they knew that thereby great gain and help would accrue to these souls. Because at that time, when the whole people and the sacerdotal assembly stand praying with arms extended, and the awe-inspiring Victim is present, how should we not placate God as we pray in their behalf?" [16]

The efficacy of suffrages for the dead is also taught by the Western writers of this period, who frequently refer to the custom of praying for the departed in the liturgical services. Besides private prayers and alms-giving, to which each one attends as devotion to his loved ones may prompt him, solemn rites are celebrated on the seventh and fortieth day after their demise. Apostles and martyrs are invoked in their behalf, and whatever is thus done for them washes away their sins and hastens their final happiness.[17] However these writers have but few references to purgatory as a special place of purification. This was possibly owing to their somewhat confused notions on eschatology, about which something will be said in the following section. It was Augustine who fully developed the doctrine of purgatory in the Western Church.

He touches both points: the existence of purgatory and the efficacy of our prayers for the departed. "Some," he writes, "suffer temporal punishment in this life only, others

[15] Adv. Haer. 75, 7.
[16] In Ep. ad Phil. 3, 4.
[17] Ambrose, Serm. 20, 22; De Excessu Frat. 1, 5, 29.

after death, and others both now and hereafter, but before that most severe and last judgment. But not all of those who bear temporal punishment after death are condemned to the everlasting pains which follow that judgment." [18] "He who does not till his field, and allows it to be overrun with thorns, receives in this life the curse of the earth in all his works, and hereafter he shall be condemned either to the fire of purgation or to eternal punishment." [19]

In answer to those who doubt whether there is fire in purgatory, he says: "It is not incredible that even after this life there should be something of the kind, but whether there really is remains a matter of dispute. And when one examines into the question, it may either be found to be so or continue to be doubtful, namely, whether some of the faithful departed are detained in a certain purgatorial fire, their salvation being thereby delayed in proportion as they have more or less loved the perishable things of this world." [20] Hence though the existence of purgatory admits of no doubt, the nature of the sufferings which souls must there endure is to some extent a matter of speculation.

On the second point, the efficacy of prayers for the dead, he is very definite. "For some of the departed," he says, "the prayers either of the Church herself or of the pious faithful are of avail; but for those only who have been regenerated in Christ, and whose life here on earth was neither so bad as to make them unworthy of His mercy, nor so good as to have no need of it." [21] And again: "Neither is it to be denied that the souls of the departed are relieved by the piety of their living relatives, when the Sacrifice of the Mediator is offered for them, or alms are given in the church." [22] These souls, he remarks in another place, are deserving of being helped after death, not because of any present merit, since they no longer can merit for themselves nor can others merit for them; but because they have so acted during life as to be worthy of mercy after death.[23]

[18] De Civ. Dei, 21, 13; cfr. Enar. in Ps. 37, 3.
[19] Cont. Manich. 2, 20, 30.
[20] Enchir. 69.
[21] De Civ. Dei, 21, 24, 2.
[22] Enchir. 110.
[23] Serm. 172, 2.

Beyond this, Catholic teaching on purgatory has hardly made any advance, even till the present day. It is true, we make much of the application of indulgences to the poor souls, but in their present form indulgences were unknown in the Patristic age. The principles underlying the doctrine were indeed understood and admitted by the Fathers, but the theory of indulgences was worked out later.

These views of Augustine soon spread and were adopted throughout the West. Some fifty years later Cæsarius of Arles speaks in terms that are fully as definite. Referring to the slighter sins, such as intemperance in eating and drinking, talking too much or too little, he says: "We do not believe that by these sins the soul is killed; but she is disfigured thereby as with so many ulcers and ugly scars, which make her unworthy to receive the embraces of her Heavenly Spouse." [24] And again: "But if we do not give thanks to God in our tribulations, nor redeem our sins by good works, we shall be detained in that purgatorial fire until the above mentioned slight sins have been consumed, as so much wood, or hay, or stubble." [25]

The same clear statements are found in the writings of Gregory I. "In the same condition as one leaves this world," he says, "one will also be found in the judgment. However it is a matter of belief that for the cleansing from light faults before the judgment there exists a purgatorial fire; for this follows from the words of the Eternal Truth, that he who uttereth a blasphemy against the Holy Spirit shall not be forgiven, either in this world or in the next." [26]

In the East, however, the doctrine of purgatory received little attention from the later writers. Even John Damascene, who summed up Greek theology, barely touches the subject. Moreover the opinion seems to have been fairly general among Eastern theologians of this period that by the purgatorial fire, of which some of the earlier Greek Fathers spoke, must be understood mental sufferings, such as remorse, shame, and sadness. This view was eventually adopted by the Greek Church.

[24] Serm. 104, 3.
[25] Ibid. 4.
[26] Dial. 4, 39.

C — Eschatological Views

Death, judgment, heaven, and hell, are the four topics usually included in the general term of eschatology. Of death nothing need be said here, as the doctrine that it is decreed for all once to die admits practically of no development.[26a] Judgment, as treated in this connection, includes both the judgment that is to follow immediately after death, and the one that is to take place at the end of time. Hence these four points, the particular judgment, the general judgment, heaven, and hell, form the subject matter of this section.

On the particular judgment both the Eastern and Western writers were fairly well agreed, at least in so far as they admitted a determination of each one's lot immediately after death. This was necessarily implied in their views on purgatory, as recorded in the preceding section. Sometimes, moreover, they stated this explicitly. Thus St. Chrysostom writes: "I think that the valiant athletes of God, who during life contended bravely with the invisible enemies, . . . shall at the end of their days be examined by the Prince of the ages." [27] He refers here only to the just because he is speaking of purgatory. St. Hilary is very explicit. If we have led a bad life, hell will be our portion. And this he proves from the parable of Dives and Lazarus. "Our witnesses," he says, "are Dives and Lazarus, of whom the Gospel speaks. One of them was carried by angels into the abode of the blessed, in Abraham's bosom; whilst the other was immediately dragged down into the place of punishment. And so immediately did the punishment follow, that it was inflicted while his brothers were still among the living. There was no interval of delay. For the day of judgment marks the beginning either of eternal blessedness or eternal pain." [28]

Nor was there any disagreement about the general judg-

[26a] It is indeed still a matter of dispute among theologians, whether those living immediately before the second advent of Christ shall actually die, or merely pass through tribulations in some measure equivalent to death; but the writings of the Fathers contain little that might be used in elucidation of this question.

[27] In Ep. ad Cor. Hom. 42, 3–7.

[28] Tract. super Ps. 2, 49.

ment, in so far as a second or last judgment comes in question. At the end of time Christ will come to judge the living and the dead. This is Scriptural data, and was from the very first professed by every believing Christian. But as to the further question of who shall be judged on the last day, all were apparently not of the same mind; although they should have been if they followed the Symbol and accepted the obvious meaning of the Sacred Writings. Thus Aphraates, the Syrian, states very plainly: "As the just, who have been perfected in good works, do not come to the judgment to be judged, so neither are the wicked, whose sins have been multiplied and the measure of whose iniquity is overflowing, compelled to come to the judgment; but as soon as they have risen from the dead, they return to hell." [29] The same opinion found also advocates in the West, as, for instance, Hilary and Zeno. According to them, neither the just nor infidels and profligates will have to undergo the judgment; but only those careless and lukewarm Christians who though believing did not live up to their faith.[30] However in regard to this peculiar view it must be borne in mind that the term judgment, at least as used in the West, may well refer to the passing of a sentence in a case that is not already evident, therefore implying a previous examination of the accused person. Hence even these authors would admit that in a wider sense of the term the last judgment will be general.

The resurrection of the dead, which is to precede the last judgment, is admitted by all; but this, again, only in so far as the mere fact of the resurrection is concerned. When there is question of the manner, or of what the resurrection really implies, opinions differ. It must, however, be noted that the vast majority take the term in its proper sense, namely, that each one shall arise in his own body which he had during life. "The resurrection," says Epiphanius, "is not affirmed of that which never fell, but of that which fell and rises again. . . . For not that which does not die, but that which dies is said to fall. It is the flesh that dies; the soul is immortal." [31]

[29] Demonstr. 22, 17.

[30] Hilary, In Ps. 1, 15–18; Zeno, Tract. 1, 21.

[31] Adv. Haer. 64, 35.

This is strongly defended by Cyril of Jerusalem and by Chrysostom. The former says: "This very body shall rise from the dead, not weak as it is now; yet this same body itself shall rise again. . . . Therefore this body itself shall rise, but it shall not remain as it is; yet it shall remain forever." [32] How this may come to pass is thus indicated by Gregory of Nyssa: "Just as the seed, which in the beginning is without form, is by the ineffable skill of God fashioned into a being of its own kind, and then grows up into bodily substances, so it is not at all unreasonable, but altogether in accord with the nature of matter, that the material part of man which is in the grave, and which formerly had a definite form, should be brought back to its erstwhile condition, and that thus man should again become dust, whence in the beginning he had his origin." [33]

The same view was taken by the majority of the Western writers. Thus Hilary, speaking of the transformation of our bodies in the resurrection, as indicated by St. Paul, says: "That which was broken God will repair; not by using any other matter, but the very same whence men had their origin, imparting to it a beauty that is in accord with His own good pleasure; so that the resurrection of our corruptible bodies in incorruption does not mean a destruction of their nature, but a change of their condition." [34] Ambrose is just as definite: "For this," he writes, "is the resurrection, as the word itself indicates, that the same which fell rises again; the same which died is brought to life." [35]

However along with this common teaching there was astir a tendency to revive the peculiar views of Origen, according to which the resurrection consists in the development of a reproductive germ, contained in each body and surviving the corruption of death. The result of this development will indeed be a real body, but it has nothing in common with that which each one had during life, except the reproductive germ. Epiphanius argued strongly against this view, which unsettled the faith of the simple; and two centuries later it was thought

[32] Catech. 17, 18, 19.
[33] Orat. 3.
[34] Tract. super Ps. 2, 41.
[35] De Exitu Frat. 2, 87.

necessary to issue a formal condemnation of Origen's teaching on this point.

After the resurrection and final judgment the just will enter with Christ into eternal life, and the wicked shall be cast into hell. On the first point there is practically no disagreement. It is true, Chrysostom and a few other theologians of the Antiochene school are sometimes adduced as denying the intuitive vision of God's essence;[36] but what they had in mind was most likely the comprehensive knowledge of God, as the texts in question seem to refer to Eunomius, who contended that God is as perfectly known by us as He is known by Himself. The common view on the object of Beatitude is thus expressed by Gregory of Nazianzus: "The bliss of heaven consists primarily in the vision of the Holy and Royal Triad, which illumines us with a great splendor and wholly communicates itself to the spirit."[37] The bodies of the blessed shall also be glorified, and shine with a great light.[38]

On the second point, the punishment of the wicked in hell, many different views appear to have been entertained during the latter part of the fourth century, both by theological writers and the common people. In the first place, Ambrosiaster among the Latins and Gregory of Nyssa among the Greeks apparently held that there would be a universal *apokatastasis*, a final restoration of all rational creatures to the friendship of God.[39] In regard to Gregory it is indeed frequently pointed out by dogmatic theologians that he has passages in which he explicitly defends the eternity of hell, but unfortunately he himself interprets that "eternity" as "long periods of time."[40]

In the next place, the view seems to have been rather common, at least in the West, that the punishment of hell would be everlasting only for the most wicked of sinners — for infidels, apostates, and the evil spirits. Even Jerome and Ambrose are said to have been inclined towards this view,[41]

[36] Cfr. Tixeront, H. D. II, 198, 199.
[37] Orat. 15.
[38] Cyr. Hier. Catech. 18, 18.
[39] In Ephes. 3, 10; Orat. Catech. 26, 35.
[40] Ibid. 26; De An. et Resurr.; P. G. 46, 72, 152, 157.
[41] Cfr. Tixeront. op. cit. 339–347.

although there are not wanting in their works passages from which one might well infer the contrary. St. Augustine, who had no patience with these lax opinions, has put on record the different views that were quite generally held at the beginning of the fifth century. Some, he says, maintain that all baptized persons will be saved; others that all those are sure of salvation who besides baptism have also received the Blessed Eucharist; others promise salvation to all Catholics without exception; others hold that there will be a universal restoration, so that in the end all will be admitted to the everlasting joys of heaven.[42]

None of these strange views, however, were based on tradition. In fact, up to the middle of the fourth century, the common teaching was rather inclined towards rigorism in the matter of salvation; and practically no one thought that out of hell there was any redemption. It was the translation of Origen's *De Principiis* by Rufinus that caused all this confusion in Latin countries. No doubt, the view was very acceptable to persons of lax moral principles, and so from the learned world it readily spread among the common people.

But even at this time the weight of authority was entirely on the side of tradition. In the East, men like Basil, Cyril of Jerusalem, Chrysostom, Didymus, and Epiphanius, were quite positive and outspoken about the eternity of hell. And the same is true of Hilary, Zeno, and Augustine in the West. Nor did they reserve the eternal punishment of hell for only "the most wicked of sinners"; they were fully convinced that it would overtake every one who did not depart this life in the friendship of God.

St. Augustine undertook the task of formally proving the eternity of hell, both from Holy Scripture and from the usage of the Church of not praying for the deliverance of the lost souls. Referring to Matthew, 25, 46, he asks: "What sense is there in thinking that the eternal punishment of hell means only a long period of time, and at the same time asserting that eternal life is without end? For in one and the same place,

[42] De Civ. Dei, 26, 17–22; Enchir. 67, 112; De Fide et Opere, 1, 22.

in one and the same sentence, taking the two together, Christ said: 'Thus these shall go into eternal punishment, but the just into life eternal.' If both are eternal, surely both must be understood to signify either a long duration of time which shall some day come to an end, or a duration without end. Both stand in the same relation: on the one hand eternal punishment, on the other life eternal. But to say in this one and the same sense: Eternal life will be without end, eternal punishment will have an end, is utterly absurd." [43]

The sufferings of the damned are of two kinds: the loss of God and positive pains. "It is an everlasting death," he argues, "when the soul can neither live, because she does not possess God; nor be without pain, because she cannot die. The first death drags the unwilling soul out of the body, the second death keeps the unwilling soul in the body." [44] These sufferings, however, will not be the same for all: "It must not be denied that even the torture of the eternal fire will be in proportion to the guilt of each, lighter for some and more severe for others; either because the intensity varies according to the punishment decreed for each one, or if the intensity remains the same, it does not inflict upon all the same pain." [45] As to the opinion of some, which was also held by Chrysostom, that the lost may at times experience a mitigation of their sufferings, he says that he neither approves nor rejects it.[46]

He also counteracted the view that all Christians, at least, can be practically certain of their final salvation, even if they lead bad lives. Neither baptism, nor the Eucharist, nor anything else will avail them aught, unless their lives be such as God demands of His faithful servants. For some time he seems to have been inclined to look for a Millennium before the end of the world, but in his later years he rejected Millennarianism altogether. He then interpreted the thousand years, spoken of by St. John in the Apocalypse, as the duration of the Church here on earth, although he was not without misgivings about the correctness of this interpretation. On the resurrection, the two judgments, and the joys of heaven, he

[43] De Civ. Dei, 21, 23.
[44] Ibid. 21, 3, 1.
[45] Ibid. 21, 16.
[46] Enchir. 112.

held practically the same as we do to-day. The identical body which was dissolved in death shall rise again; it shall be spiritualized, as is taught by St. Paul, but it will always remain a material body. The final judgment lasts only an instant, and thereafter eternal life or everlasting pain, according to each one's deserts.

These clear expositions stemmed the tide of Origenistic speculations in the West, and during the remainder of the Patristic age they were made the basis of sermons and ascetical instructions. Some details were still further developed, but on the whole eschatology remained where Augustine had left it. And as he left it, so do we find it to-day; except that some points have been defined which he defended simply as contained in tradition and Holy Scripture.

A word may here be added about the doctrine of the Communion of Saints. The term found its way into the Symbol only in later days, but the truth for which it stands was well understood and firmly believed in the earliest times. It is necessarily implied in the veneration of the blessed in heaven and the suffrages for the poor souls in purgatory. For it is only because the faithful, no matter where they are, constitute one body of which Christ is the head, that they can pray for and assist one another. This idea was frequently brought out by the writers of the early centuries. Thus Augustine says: "Neither are the souls of the faithful departed separated from the Church, which is even now the kingdom of Christ." [47] "You know and you acknowledge and you understand that our Head is Christ; we are the body of that Head. We alone? And not rather also those who have gone before us? All the just, even from the beginning of time, have Christ as their Head." [48]

[47] De Civ. Dei, 20, 9.

[48] Enar. in Ps. 36; Ser. 3, 4.

CHAPTER XXXI

SOME SUPPLEMENTARY REMARKS ON SUBJECTS DEALT WITH IN THE PRECEDING CHAPTERS[1]

It must have been noticed by the reader that, with the sole exception of Christology, the development of doctrine came practically to a standstill after the first quarter of the fifth century. This is only partly accounted for by the far-reaching results achieved by St. Augustine. He left many a point of doctrine still capable of further development, and under normal conditions his patient and successful labors should have acted as a powerful incentive in the case of his successors to work along similar lines. But unfortunately, during the three centuries that followed his death, conditions were not normal. The East was disrupted by protracted and violent disputes on account of the Nestorian, Eutychian, and Monothelite heresies, which made the quiet study of other doctrines almost impossible. The West, on the other hand, was during this same period of time constantly harassed by the devastating incursion of barbarian tribes from the North, so that it was even a matter of the greatest difficulty to preserve what had been accomplished by the great men of the past. The Church of Africa, which had figured so largely in the promotion of doctrinal development, was almost ruined by the fierce persecutions of the Arian Vandals, whilst that of Italy, Spain, and Gaul barely escaped a similar fate at the hands of the Ostrogoths, the Visigoths, and the Franks. Religion and learning found a comparatively safe retreat only within the walls of monasteries, which since the middle of the fourth century had begun to cover Southern Europe. It was a time when the sword supplanted the pen, and the Church had to begin anew her work of evangelizing the Gentiles. Under these conditions there

[1] Cfr. Tixeront, H. D. III, 185–265, 302–420.

was little opportunity of developing the Gospel message.

However these times were not altogether sterile. Men like Fulgentius, Ferrandus, Cassiodorus, Cæsarius, Ildephonsus, Isidore, and Venerable Bede, carefully preserved and even somewhat expanded the precious heirloom of the past in the Western Church; whilst in the East, Cyril, Theodoret, Maximus, Nilus, Isidore of Pelusium, and others, found time to set down their views on points of doctrine not directly connected with the Christological controversy. And fortunately, too, during these times of stress and strain the Church was blessed with a succession of great Popes, Celestine, Leo, Martin, Agatho, and Gregory, who wielded the scepter of their Apostolic authority with no uncertain hand, and at the same time were an inspiration to others in the common duty of defending and explaining the faith. Hence some supplementary remarks must here be made in reference to subjects that have been more carefully treated in connection with the work of the fourth century writers. This will give us a better perspective of the results achieved.

These remarks, however, must necessarily be very brief, and so there is no need of dividing the chapter into sections; still for clearness' sake we will set down a number of points, indicating under each what appears to be of greater importance.

1°. *Anthropology.*— On this subject there was already some difference of views among the fourth-century writers, as was indicated in a previous chapter. All were indeed agreed that man was created by God, and, excepting Didymus and Victorinus, also that there is only one soul in man; but on the further question, whether individual souls are produced by a creative act of God or come *ex traduce seminis,* opinions differed. Gregory of Nazianzus, Hilary, Ambrose, and Jerome, taught Creationism very definitely; whilst Didymus, Epiphanius, and Augustine, did not know what to think. During the following centuries Eastern writers generally held that each individual soul is created by God at the moment of its union with the body, but among the Latins there was considerable difference of opinion. Thus Cassiodorus, Genna-

dius, Cassian, and the Semi-Pelagians generally, were Creationists; while Fulgentius, Gregory, Ildephonsus, declared the soul's origin to be unknown, but favored Traducianism. Cassiodorus thus defines the soul: "Anima hominis est a Deo creata, spiritalis, propriaque substantia, sui corporis vivificatrix, rationalis quidem et immortalis, sed in bonum malumque convertibilis." [2] Practically the same definition is given by Isidore of Seville, except that he substitutes for "a Deo creata," "habens ignotam originem." The view of Faustus and Gennadius, that the soul is corporeal, because quantitatively localized, was immediately rejected by all.

2°. *Grace.*— In the West the decisions of Orange met with a general acceptance. All subsequent writers admit the necessity of grace, both for the beginning and perfecting of salutary actions; but at the same time they insist also on free human coöperation. "The supernal goodness," writes Gregory, "first acts in us without us, so that, when our own free will follows the impulse, He may accomplish together with us the good which we desire; which good, nevertheless, on account of the grace imparted, He so rewards in the last judgment as if it had been produced by us alone." [3] On predestination, the fate of unbaptized children, and the necessity of good works for salvation, the views of Augustine were commonly followed. Thus Isidore uses strictly Augustinian terms when he writes: "Grace is not conferred on account of any previous merits, but solely in consequence of the divine will. Nor is any one saved or lost, chosen or rejected, except in accordance with God's decree of predestination, who is just in reference to the reprobate and merciful in regard to the elect." [4] The number of the elect was generally looked upon as small.

The Eastern writers were little influenced by the discussions on the subject of grace that were finally terminated by the synod of Orange. They simply continued the teaching of their great fourth-century Fathers. As a general rule, they strongly emphasized the power of unaided nature to practice natural virtues, although they were at the same time careful

[2] De Anima, 2.
[3] Moral. 16, 30.
[4] Differ. 2, 19.

to note that salvation is impossible without the grace of God. Their position is perhaps best indicated by St. Cyril, when he writes: "There is one faith that depends on us, and another that is the gift of God. It belongs to us to begin the good work, to place all our trust and faith in God; and it belongs to the grace of God to give us perseverance in good and strength to accomplish." [5] Or as St. Nilus words it: "Although without God's help we can accomplish nothing, yet it is our duty to make a good choice and to strive after good, whilst it is the part of God to give our desires their realization." [6] They do not ascribe the bestowal of grace or the attainment of salvation to merely natural merit in any sense, yet they place a much stronger emphasis on the necessity of a person's good disposition antecedent to the divine help than do their Latin contemporaries. Still this does not prevent them from saying with Cyril: "It is not in the power of those who wish to live holily to do so in effect, unless they be called." [7]

3°. *Original Sin.*— The respective position of the Eastern and Western writers during this period with regard to original sin was practically the same as that in reference to grace. The West was strongly influenced by the condemnation of Pelagianism, and readily fell in with the views of Augustine; whilst the East seemed little aware of the fact that an authoritative decision had been given in the matter. Not that they were in any way infected with the Pelagian heresy, but they hardly treated the subject except in a casual way, as had been done by their Fathers of the fourth century. Some of them, like Cyril of Alexandria, Abbot Maximus, and Proclus of Constantinople, state quite plainly that "the heart of all men has been defiled by transgression in Adam," that "through Adam we have all subscribed to sin," that "Christ alone is free from the inherited stain"; yet others, like Theodoret of Cyrus, and Isidore of Pelusium, without actually denying the doctrine of original sin, dwell almost exclusively on the physical evils that have come to us through the fall of our first parents. Hence although the Council of Ephesus, in its letter to Pope Celestine,

[5] In Luc. 17, 5.
[6] Ep. 4, 15.
[7] In Luc. 13, 23.

subscribed to the sentence of Zozimus against the Pelagians, it appears that the Eastern writers in general failed to appreciate the position taken by the West.

4°. *Soteriology.*— The three different theories on the subject of redemption, which, as was stated in a previous chapter, were current during the fourth century, continued to be held by the writers of this period; with the difference, however, that a decided preference was given to the Realistic or Substitution Theory. The idea that a ransom had been paid to Satan was rejected by all, though preachers still emphasized the fact that, by his unjust proceedings against Christ, Satan had lost his power over the fallen race. Cyril in the East and Leo in the West strongly favored the Mystical Theory, conceiving it as more or less necessary that the corruption of fallen nature should have been healed by its physical contact with the Godhead in Christ. However along with this, they also endorsed the more common view, that "if Christ had not died for us, we should not have been saved"; or as Leo expressed it: "The passion of Christ contains the mystery of our salvation." The Incarnation as such was not sufficient for our redemption. St. Cyril develops this in detail, and his view continues to be that of the Greek Church. These writers also point out that no created being could have redeemed man: a God-Man was required to give condign satisfaction to God's offended Majesty. Christ's satisfaction, however, is not only condign, but also superabundant; for whatever He did or suffered had an infinite moral value.

5°. *Ecclesiology.*— As the Fathers of Chalcedon ascribed the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed to the Second General Council, this symbol was soon after received into the liturgy. In it occurs the phrase: We believe "in One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church." This may be said to represent, in general outline, the ecclesiological teaching of the period with which we are now concerned. As there is only one baptism, and one faith, the members of the Church are necessarily united into one body; and therefore the Church is One. Such was the view taken of it in the East, where the unity of government was ordinarily but little emphasized; whereas in the

West greater insistence was placed upon the unity that arises from due subjection of the faithful to a divinely constituted authority. This one Church was destined by Christ to embrace all mankind, and does so even now to a large extent; hence she is also Catholic, and outside her pale there is no salvation. Founded for the very purpose of sanctifying her members, she is necessarily Holy; yet this holiness does not mean that she is exclusively made up of the just, for she is a "corpus mixtum"; but rather that she offers to every one of her children efficacious means of salvation. Such the Church has been from the days of the Apostles, who preached the same faith, administered the same sacraments, and whose work is continued by the priesthood of to-day; consequently she is truly Apostolic.

All this, as will be readily noticed, marks no advance over the teaching of the fourth-century Fathers. Their views on the Church of Christ are preserved, but there is no attempt to lengthen the lines of development. In the West there was no need of it, as Augustine had practically accomplished the work at the beginning of the fifth century; but in the East there was both need and opportunity, at least of appropriating the clearer views of their Western contemporaries. And the reason why it was not done arose to a great extent from the subserviency of the episcopate to the secular power. Although individual bishops protested that they held their power from God, that lay persons might not presume to pass judgment upon them, that even the dignity of princes was inferior to theirs, yet as a body they weakly submitted to the arrogance of dogmatizing emperors, who, in not few instances, summoned and dissolved local synods without anybody's leave, accepted or rejected conciliar decisions as they saw fit, issued professions of faith as the spirit moved them, and acted in every way as if they were invested with supreme authority in the Church of Christ. By an unfortunate concession acquiesced in by the Councils of Constantinople and Chalcedon, although persistently opposed by the Popes, the Patriarch of Constantinople obtained the first place after the Bishop of Rome, and as he was frequently little more than a court-prelate, the emperors had a free hand.

This not only prepared the way for a final schism, but also sapped the vitality of Eastern Christianity while still in union with the Church of Christ.

However, with all this secularizing tendency, the East never ceased during these troublous times to acknowledge the Primacy of the Apostolic See. The Roman Church was to bishops and people the Church of Peter, and Peter was by all of them considered as the Rock upon which the Church was built. Theodoret, Flavian, John Talaias, and even Nestorius, Eutyches, and Sergius, appealed to the Popes as the highest authority in matters of doctrine and Church government; and no Patriarch of Constantinople ever regarded himself as firmly established in his see unless his election were ratified and confirmed by the Bishop of Rome. Hence there can be no doubt that during these centuries the entire Eastern Church recognized the Primacy of Rome, even if through self-interest many a bishop thrust it aside at critical moments. Celestine, Leo, Hormisdas, and Agatho were perfectly cognizant of this when they dictated the faith to Eastern Councils; and, as Eastern historians themselves testify, no one ever thought that in pursuing this course the Popes went beyond the legitimate extent of their authority.

In the West, during these same centuries, the Primacy of Rome was universally acknowledged; and this even notwithstanding the fact that, in opposition to the Fifth General Council and to Pope Vigilius, some Western provinces withdrew for a time from communion with Rome. Peter was believed to have been constituted by Christ as the foundation and head of the universal Church, her master and her infallible teacher, and Peter continued to live and teach in his successors. Hence in questions of doctrine and general discipline the decisions of the Pope were received as final, and his decretals had the same force as the canons of councils. Fulgentius of Ruspe, Maximus of Turin, Peter Chrysologus, and Venerable Bede bear witness to this; while Leo and Gregory frequently enlarge upon the authority of the Roman See as a fact that is understood and acknowledged by all.

6°. *The Sacraments.*— Sacramental theology was during

this period retarded in its development rather than advanced. This was largely owing to Isidore of Seville, who set aside the Augustinian definition of the sacraments as efficacious signs and reverted to the antiquated notion of mysteries. Speaking of the three sacraments of initiation, he says: "They are called sacraments because under the cover of corporeal things the divine virtue effects in a hidden manner the secret and sacred operations of salvation, which they were intended to confer."[8] The external rite is indeed a sign, and is accompanied by a spiritual effect in the soul, but its symbolic significance is pushed into the background. Instead of manifesting, it is intended to hide the "secret and sacred operations" of the Holy Spirit. Isidore's views were adopted by many subsequent writers, especially during the ninth century. The number of the sacraments, in so far as the use of the term itself came in question, was not yet determined. Isidore applies the term to baptism, confirmation, and the Eucharist; Leo designates holy orders as the "sacramenta sacerdotii," and Salvianus of Marseilles calls matrimony the "connubii sacramenta." In the East the Pseudo-Areopagite gave a list of six sacraments or mysteries; baptism, confirmation, the Eucharist, orders, monastic profession, and funeral rites. This list was often repeated by subsequent writers. Hence although, as was pointed out in a previous chapter, the seven religious rites, now exclusively designated as sacraments, were universally regarded as essential to the Christian religion, they were not yet gathered under one specific term which set them apart from other and somewhat similar rites.

In regard to the validity of the sacraments when administered by heretics there was still some confusion in the different churches. However, excepting holy orders, the mere fact of heresy by itself was hardly anywhere considered as invalidating the sacramental rite. All depended on the kind of heresy in which the sacraments were conferred. Thus whenever baptism was administered in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, it was not repeated either

[8] De Corpore et Sanguine Domini, 8.

in the East or the West; unless, indeed, the doctrine of the Trinity was denied by the heretics in question. Hence converts from heresy were usually reconciled by a simple imposition of hands *in poenitentiam,* though this was in some places accompanied by an unction with holy chrism. From this latter ceremony it has sometimes been inferred that confirmation was repeated, but the evidence is rather in favor of the contrary view.

Baptism and confirmation were still conferred on the same occasion; the former by a triple immersion which was accompanied by an invocation of the Blessed Trinity, and the latter by the imposition of hands and the anointing of the forehead with blessed chrism. For confirmation the *Egyptian Church Constitutions* give the formula: "I anoint thee through God the Father Almighty, and Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit."

The Holy Eucharist was to all the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ. Tixeront sums up the teaching of the Eastern Church at this time as follows: (1) In the Eucharist we receive really and truly the body and blood of Jesus Christ. (2) That body and blood are there through the efficacy either of the words of institution, or of the epiclesis, or of both. (3) Those words, or the Holy Spirit whom they invoke, produce in the oblata a μεταβολή (change), the mystery of which St. Cyril of Jerusalem and St. Gregory of Nyssa endeavored to explain. (4) The Eucharistic liturgy constitutes a sacrifice. (5) The reception of the Eucharist washes away our sins, unites us to God, and implants in our bodies a germ of life and immortality.[9]

With two slight modifications, this summary also represents the Western teaching on the Eucharist at the time. These two modifications are in reference to the epiclesis and the manner in which the Real Presence was considered. Although the epiclesis occurs in some Western liturgies, especially in those of the Gallican type, nevertheless the common teaching was that the change in the oblata must be attributed to the words of institution. Then as regards the Real Presence, this was held

[9] H. D. III, 226.

just as firmly in the West as in the East, but there was at work a tendency to emphasize the spiritual aspect of the Eucharist. It is not the mere eating of Christ's body and the drinking of His blood that profits unto salvation, but the becoming united with Him through faith and charity of which the Eucharist is a symbol. In this Augustine's influence is discernible, but there is nowhere a trace of a merely symbolic conception.[10]

Penance experienced a considerable transformation during this period, but wholly along disciplinary lines, and so it need not detain us here. The principle that grievous sins must be confessed in order to obtain forgiveness was in vigor everywhere, as indeed it had been from the beginning of Christianity. Nor did anyone question the traditional belief that this forgiveness was effected through the ministration of the Church. From the fifth century forward, public penance became less frequent, although it was still the rule for sins that caused great scandal. The duty of hearing confessions devolved more and more upon simple priests, and especially upon monks. Considerable attention was given to the classification of sins as venial and mortal, of which St. Cæsarius supplies us with the following example: "Although the Apostle mentions many capital sins, nevertheless, so as not to give cause for despair, we shall briefly enumerate which they are: sacrilege, homicide, adultery, false witness, theft, rapine, pride, envy, avarice; and, if it lasts for a long time, anger; also drunkenness if very great: these are accounted among their number." [11] Then turning his attention to venial sins, he says: "What sins are slight, although known to all, still it is necessary that we should mention a few of them. As often as one takes more food or drink than is required, he must understand that it is a slight sin; and also when one speaks more than is becoming, or is unduly silent." [12] Lists of this kind soon found their way into the so-called *Penitentials*, or books intended for the guidance of the confessor in determining the penance that was to be enjoined for the different sins. Needless to say, this

[10] Cfr. Pourrat, Teaching of the Fathers on the Real Presence, 38 sqq.

[11] Serm. 104, 2.

[12] Ibid. 3.

penance was very severe as compared to our modern practice.

Extreme unction is rather frequently mentioned, both in the East and West. It is recommended as being in conformity with the direction of St. James to anoint the sick. A little later St. Boniface directed his missionary priests not to go on a journey "without the chrism, the blessed oil, and the Eucharist," so that they might be always ready to minister to the spiritual needs of the faithful.[13]

Holy orders are spoken of in detail by the Pseudo-Areopagite, who mentions that the three higher orders are conferred by imposition of hands, and that in the consecration of a bishop the Holy Scriptures are held open over the head of the candidate. The Constitutions of the Egyptian Church give the prayers that accompany the imposition of hands. Besides the three higher orders there are those of the subdeacon and readers, but in conferring these the bishop simply recites a prayer and hands the book of the Epistles to the candidates. The same five orders are also mentioned by John Damascene, and they are found in the Greek Church to-day. For the Western Church similar ceremonies are prescribed in the *Statuta Ecclesiae Antiqua,* which, however, enumerate nine orders. To the three major and four minor orders, as we have them at present, is added that of psalmists, whilst bishops and priests are counted separately.

In the East it was quite a common practice during these centuries to reordain those who had received their ordination from heretical bishops, but up to the sixth century this was not done in the West. About that time, however, the custom was also introduced in some Western countries, notably in Britain, through the ruling of Theodore of Canterbury who before his elevation to that see was a Cilician monk. Similarly "the ordinations made by the intruded Pope Constantine in 768 were probably declared null. At all events, it is certain that Pope Sergius III (904–911), yielding to a sentiment of mean revenge, had the ordinations made by Pope Formosus repeated." [14]

[13] Statuta, 29, P. L. 89, 823.

[14] Cfr. Pourrat, Theology of the Sacraments, 157.

Matrimony was regarded by all as a state which Christ had sanctified by His presence at the marriage feast in Cana, and which, in consequence, the Church must also sanctify. In the West it was sometimes spoken of as a sacrament, but there is nothing definite to indicate explicitly that this term was taken in the strict sense. With regard to its permanency there were different views. The Eastern Church allowed absolute divorce on account of adultery, but only in favor of the husband. The Western Church, on the other hand, stood firm for absolute indissolubility, until Theodore of Canterbury introduced the Greek practice into Britain. From there it spread to some parts of Northern France, but it was vigorously opposed by Rome and gradually disappeared. Disparity of religion, affinity arising from baptism, consanguinity, rape, and sponsalia were some of the impediments that made marriage invalid.

These few remarks on the principal topics of general theology, as it is found in the writings that belong to the last three centuries of the Patristic age, might be very fittingly concluded by a brief analysis of the writings of St. John Damascene, who gave Greek theology the form which it has retained till the present time. However the compendious nature of this book makes it advisable not to attempt anything so pretentious. Nor is there real need of it as far as the demands of the History of Dogmas go. For John Damascene, although a Doctor of the Church, was not an original writer; he was a compiler and to some extent a systematizer. He faithfully gathered together what was contained in the writings of his predecessors, and then reproduced it in his *Sources of Knowledge* as a fairly compact system of theological teaching. Moreover the work which made him justly famous, his defense of the veneration of images, will be considered in the next chapter.

CHAPTER XXXII

THE IMAGE CONTROVERSY: THE SEVENTH GENERAL COUNCIL[1]

By images, in this connection, are understood representations of our Blessed Saviour, of angels, and of saints, whether in painting, mosaic, or statuary. In regard to them two things must be clearly distinguished: use and veneration. The use of images may be of various kinds: (a) for decorative purposes, whether in churches or out of them; (b) for instruction, in so far as they are a concrete representation of past events or mysteries of the faith; (c) for the promotion of piety, in as much as by their appeal to the heart they draw the beholder to God. Veneration consists in the outward manifestation of respect and reverence, and as such it may be absolute or relative. It is absolute when it terminates at the object towards which it is proximately directed; it is relative when it reaches beyond the immediate object and terminates at a prototype. The veneration of images is always relative, that is, it passes on to the person represented by the image. Again, this relative veneration may be an act of divine worship or of simple respect and reverence due to creatures, according as the image represents a divine or a created person. In the former case it is called adoration, in the latter it is now commonly designated by the generic term of veneration, although in past ages the term adoration, taken in a wider sense as equivalent to veneration, was quite frequently used.

The image controversy extended both to the East and the

[1] Cfr. Hefele, History of the Councils, V, 342–391; Tixeront, H. D. III, 420–467; Funk, Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen, I; Wilpert, Die Malereien in den Katakomben Roms; Liell, Die Darstellungen der allerseligsten Jungfrau und Gottesgebaererin Maria auf den Kunstdenkmaelern in den Katakomben; McGinnis, The Communion of Saints, 258–327.

West, but under different aspects. In the East it involved not only the veneration but also the use of images, whereas in the West it was restricted to veneration only, no objection being made to the use of images even in churches.

A — Historical Aspect of the Question

It is historically certain that the Church made use of images from the earliest years of her existence. This appears to evidence from ancient writers and from discoveries made in the Catacombs. Nor was she at all particular about the objects represented, provided they bore some relation to persons or events or mysteries connected with the faith. They were taken indifferently from the Old and New Testament, or even from the lives of the saints. Thus in the Catacombs are found representatives of Noe and the Deluge, of Daniel in the lion's den, of Moses striking the rock, of the Good Shepherd, of the wise and foolish virgins, of the vine and the branches. There are images of the Saviour, of the Mother and Child, and of the martyrs of the faith. Baptism, the Eucharist, and other liturgical subjects are represented, either in painting or done in mosaic. Even a bronze statue of Sts. Peter and Paul, dating, it is commonly believed, from the second century, is among the objects unearthed from beneath the wreckage of ancient Rome.[2] Tertullian mentions that it was quite common to have images of the Good Shepherd engraven on the sacred vessels used in the liturgical service.[3]

Most of these representations date from times of persecution, when the Church was still forced to shun the light of day, and was therefore much restricted in developing the solemnity of her worship. After she had been set free by Constantine and was allowed to erect her magnificent basilicas, she had no hesitation about adorning their walls with the pictured story of her faith and worship, and so to assist the unlettered in realizing more intimately the full import of her teaching. Hence St. Basil, while delivering a panegyric on St. Barlaam, who had been martyred for the faith, thus appeals to the

[2] McGinnis, op. cit. 275. [3] De Pudic. 7, 10.

artists for an exercise of their skill in the saint's honor: "Arise, O distinguished artists: perfect this poor word picture of the martyr. With deft stroke depict in vivid color the triumphs of this valiant athlete. Let him stand forth to the gaze a victorious champion. On your storied canvas depict also Christ, the Head of the martyrs." [4]

But whilst the common view and practice thus undoubtedly favored the use of images, there were not wanting some who thought it proper to raise their voices in protest. A few of them, like Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria, seemed to think that the Old Testament prohibition applied also to the New Dispensation, and so they would do away with all images; whilst others, among them Minutius Felix and Lactantius, did not object to images as such but only to those that represented God in human guise. Frequently, too, the Synod of Elvira in Spain, held about 305, is adduced as opposed to the use of images. It decreed "that pictures should not be painted in churches, and that objects which are worshiped and adored must not be painted on walls." [5] But whether this decree was inspired by opposition to the use of images or by the desire to correct abuses that had crept in is not altogether clear. At all events, there is no record of any general Church legislation on this matter, and yet the use of images was practically universal. Hence the necessary inference is that the Church considered it to be in no way opposed to the purity of her faith.

In regard to the veneration of images the practice of the early Church is less firmly established. The fact that images of our Blessed Saviour and His Holy Mother are found in the earliest places of worship may indeed well imply that some kind of veneration was paid them, and many modern writers maintain this; but the inference is perhaps not altogether certain. Though the Church even then approved of image veneration in principle as she does now, circumstances were such that one would hardly expect her to have encouraged it in practice. For large numbers of her children were converts

[4] Orat. in Barlaam, 3.

[5] Mansi, 2, 11; cfr. Funk, op. cit. I, 346–352.

from paganism, whose memories were still filled with recollections of idol-worship, and hence she might well fear that the veneration of images would be misunderstood or lead to abuse. Hence if the practice obtained at all, it is not likely to have been very common.

But however the matter may stand in this regard, it is quite certain that the Church regarded the veneration of images to be in perfect conformity with her belief. For as soon as conditions had sufficiently changed to make the practice safe, she allowed it to grow up without a word of protest. Scarcely half a century after she had been liberated by Constantine, Julian the Apostate reproached the Christians with adoring the wood of the cross and the painted images on the walls of their houses, which obviously supposes veneration of some kind.[6] About the same time Asterius of Amasea describes pictures that represented St. Euphemia, and adds that the cross was adored by Christian worshipers.[7] A century later, Theodoret of Cyrus refers to the adoration of the cross as a common practice among Greeks and Barbarians.[8] And similar testimonies are found in the works of contemporary Western writers.

Nor do these writers only bear witness to the fact, but they also explain the principle. Thus Cyril of Alexandria writes in the first part of the fifth century: "Though we make images of saintly men, we do not venerate them as gods, but merely wish to be inspired by their example to imitate them. But the image of Christ we make in order to fire our hearts with love for Him. Assuredly we do not adore a perishable image or the likeness of a perishable man. But since God, without changing Himself, condescended to become man, we represent Him as a man, though we are well aware that He is by nature God. We do not, therefore, call the image God, but we know that He whom it represents is God."[9]

A century later, the deacon Rusticus, nephew of Pope Vigilius, thus argues against the Monophysites: "We adore

[6] Cyril Alexand. Cont. Jul. 6; P. G. 48, 826.
[7] In Laud. S. Euphem. P. G. 40, 337.
[8] Graec. Aff. Curat. 6.
[9] In Ps. 113, 16.

the cross and through it Him whose cross it is; however we do not adore the cross along with Christ." [10] It is a divine worship, but only relative. It does not have the material cross for its object, but Christ who suffered on the cross for the redemption of the world. It is not the wood that is adored, nor the mere form of the cross, but the crucified God-Man who sanctified the wood of the cross by the outpouring of His blood. This was even more clearly explained by Leontius of Neapolis who wrote a few years later. "When the two parts of the cross are united," he says, "I adore it, because of Christ who was crucified thereon; when they are separated, I cast them aside and burn them. When we, the sons of Christians, adore the cross, we do not worship the substance of the wood; but we consider it as the seal and signature of Christ: through it we salute and adore Him who was crucified on it. Thus also, when we Christians possess and salute an image of Christ, or of an Apostle, or of a martyr, we think of Christ or His martyr." [11] Not even St. Thomas could have given a clearer or more orthodox exposition.

As is evident from the last part of the above citation, not only the adoration of the cross, but also the veneration of images representing saints was a well established practice towards the end of the sixth century, when Leontius wrote in its defense against those who charged the Christians with idolatry. This had grown up rather slowly, but there are records of it about a century earlier. Thus Theodoret relates that in Rome the Christians placed statuettes of Simon Stylites in the vestibules of their houses in order to secure the saint's protection.[12] When Fortunatus, in the early part of the sixth century, was suffering from a disease of the eyes, he was cured by using oil from a lamp that was kept burning before an image of St. Martin in one of the churches of Ravenna.[13] A similar practice grew up in the East, and by the beginning of the seventh century was firmly established in Christian communities. It is recorded by Maximus the Confessor how he and his companions, when gathered at a conference, fell on

[10] Cont. Acephal.; P. G. 67, 1218.
[11] Mansi, 13, 44–53.
[12] Hist. Relig. 26; P. G. 82.
[13] De Vita Mart. 6, 690.

their knees and kissed the holy Gospels, the venerable cross, and the image of our Lord and His Blessed Mother.[14]

Hence it was not only the common people, the simple and unlettered, but also priests and bishops, men well versed in Scripture and theology, who paid homage and religious veneration to the images of the saints. They understood perfectly well that the material object was not deserving of reverence, but through it they reverenced the saint whom it was intended to represent. As Leontius of Neapolis expressed it: "When we Christians possess and salute an image of Christ, or of an Apostle, or of a martyr, we think of Christ or His martyr." Yet it is quite possible that here and there abuses crept in. Some of the more simple might at times fail to distinguish between the representation and the person represented; others, again, though well understanding the nature of the cult, might nevertheless carry it to extremes, pinning their faith to pictures and statues and forgetting about the more solemn obligations of their religion: but as every good gift of God may be and is at times abused, the Church in spite of all these casual abuses never felt herself called upon to oppose the growing practice of venerating the images of God's saints. It was from other quarters that opposition finally came.

B — The Iconoclast Heresy

It appears that the first opposition to images and their veneration had its origin at Damascus in Syria, where the Caliph, instigated, it is said, by a Jewish magician, ordered the destruction of all paintings and statues venerated by his Christian subjects. His orders were immediately carried out by the Jewish and Mohammedan populace, who even went to such lengths as to whitewash the walls of the churches so as to blot out the images depicted thereon. However the storm in Syria was shortlived, owing to the death of the Caliph. His successor looked at the matter in a different light.

Then a similar storm broke out in the Eastern Empire. The originators were a number of discontented bishops, led

[14] P. G. 90, 156.

by Constantine of Nacolia, Thomas of Claudiopolis, and Theodosius of Ephesus, who prepared the way for the violent measures of Leo the Isaurian. Leo, who was but an ignorant soldier clad in royal purple, gave a willing ear to the suggestion of these bishops. The idea of suppressing this recrudescence of pagan idolatry, as the matter was represented to him, agreed well with his general plan of reforming Church and State. Hence in the year 726, he issued a decree ordering the removal of all holy images wherever found. This, however, met with considerable opposition. At Constantinople some of his officers, who tried to destroy an image of Christ in the imperial palace, were killed by the people. In Greece and the Cyclades islands a formal revolt broke out, and all Italy took forcible measures to frustrate the Emperor's designs. This made him hesitate for a while, but in 730 he deposed the Patriarch Germanus, whom he had failed to terrify into submission, and replaced him by Anastasius. This latter soon became a pliant tool of the government, and through his intervention most of the Eastern bishops were won over to the Emperor's views.

But the West remained firm in its opposition. Gregory II, whilst trying his best to preserve political union with Constantinople, threatened Anastasius with deposition unless he changed his course, and at the same time he wrote several letters to the Emperor trying to bring him to a saner state of mind. His successor, Gregory III, was equally firm, and after several vain efforts to come to an understanding with Leo, he convoked a synod at Rome (731), by which the following declaration was drawn up: "If any one hereafter, contemning those who follow the ancient custom of the Apostolic Church, is found to be an assaulter, destroyer, profaner, or blasphemer of the veneration of sacred images, to wit: Of God and our Lord Jesus Christ, of His Holy Mother the immaculate and glorious ever Virgin Mary, of the blessed Apostles and of all the saints, let him be debarred from the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, or be separated from the unity and communion of the whole Church." [15] The

[15] Lib. Pontif. I, 146.

Emperor's answer to this bold decree was a strong fleet, sent to subdue Italy by force; but it was wrecked in the Adriatic Sea, and so Italy continued in its opposition.

Already some years before this an able defender of the veneration of images had arisen in the East, who was soon looked up to as the champion of orthodoxy in every part of the Christian world. This was John Damascene. He wrote three different treatises on the subject (726-731), in which he explained the nature of the veneration of images and showed that it was in perfect accord with Christian principles. The prohibition of the Old Testament, touching this matter, he set aside as affecting only the Jews. Then, pointing out how this created world is an image of the Creator, how the Old Testament is an image of the New, how the Son is the Image of the Father, he showed from the nature of image-veneration itself, that, so far from being idolatrous, it contributes greatly to the honor and glory of God.

It is true, he says, these images are material and created things, but the question is precisely, whether material and created things cannot be an object of veneration. Are not the body and the blood of the Saviour created? Yet they are objects of adoration. Are not the chalices and other consecrated vessels material? Yet they are objects of veneration. Why, then, not the cross and images?

Furthermore, the veneration of the cross and of images is not absolute; it is only relative. It is not directed to the material objects, but to the persons represented. This fundamental principle was already proclaimed by St. Basil, who wrote: "The honor paid to images passes over to the prototype."

Again, one must distinguish between adoration in a strict sense and in a wider sense. The former is an act of divine worship, and as such can be directed only to a divine person, or, in a relative sense, to things in some special way consecrated by their intimate connection with the Godhead. The latter is simply a testification of respect and honor, on account of some created excellence, and may therefore be paid to persons or their representations without the least trace of idolatry. This

veneration is religious, when the excellence that calls it forth is of a religious nature; it is civil, when that excellence is merely natural. Hence if on account of some natural excellence, whether of person or position, civil veneration may be paid to masters, princes, and emperors, as all admit; why, on account of a higher excellence, may not religious veneration be paid to the saints of God, whether directly or through their images?

Add to this, that, aside from their veneration, images are very useful to the people: they are the books of the illiterate, reminders of God's goodness and the Saviour's mercy, preachers of holy lives, and channels of divine grace; hence to destroy them is as cruel as it is impious. And finally, whatever be the religious aspect of the question, it is certainly not for the Emperor to mix himself up with matters that lie beyond his jurisdiction: he has been appointed to rule the State, not to dominate over the Church of God.[16]

Leo died on June 18, 740, and was succeeded by his son, Constantine V, surnamed Copronymous. Owing to political troubles, Constantine allowed matters to rest until 753, when he thought himself strong enough to put his father's designs into execution. For this purpose he convened a council at Constantinople, at which, however, neither the Patriarchs of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria, nor the Pope were represented. It was presided over by the Iconoclast Theodosius of Ephesus, son of the former Emperor Tiberius II. The Acts of this synod, preserved by the Seventh General Council, give the following reasons for the condemnation of images:

1°. It is impossible to paint the image of Jesus Christ: because the artist either pretends to represent the God-Man, and then he circumscribes the divinity and confounds the natures, and thereby becomes a Monophysite; or he wishes to represent only the humanity, and then he divides the natures, and by so doing he becomes a Nestorian. Obviously those who venerate these images share in the one or the other heresy. The only true image of the Saviour, given us by Himself, is the Eucharist: let the faithful adore this.

[16] P. G. 94, 1232–1420.

2°. So, too, is it impossible to represent the Godhead, or any one of the three divine persons. Such representations all suppose that God is material and finite, which is obviously heretical.

3°. Images of the Virgin, and of the saints generally, are simply idols, and as such they cannot be tolerated among Christians: to venerate them is to practice idolatry.

4°. Furthermore, even if it were not idolatry, still it would not be right; for since the saints are with God, it would be an impious attempt to prolong their stay on earth by means of images and to represent their glorious persons by such vile matter.

5°. Finally, the veneration of images is evidently against the teaching of Holy Scripture and the Fathers.[17]

These several reasons adduced against the use and veneration of images are followed by a number of anathematisms, summing up the doctrine of the synod and condemning such persons as Germanus, the former patriarch of Constantinople, George of Cyrus, and above all Mansour, by which opprobrious epithet they designated John Damascene. Attention is also called to the lawfulness of the invocation of Holy Mary and of the other saints, so as to counteract extreme measures in this regard.

When the synod was over, the work of destruction began. Churches were profaned, images and statues were destroyed wherever found, and bishops, priests, and even the laity were required to subscribe the decisions of the synod. Most of the secular clergy yielded, but no impression could be made on the monks. They stood up bravely for the teaching and practice of the Church, ready to endure exile, torture, and death. The persecution reached its height in 761, when it almost looked as if the days of Diocletian had returned. Even Constantine, the original instigator of the whole trouble, fell a victim to the fury of the imperial tyrant. It was, however, mostly confined to the East, where it was kept up till the Emperor's death in 775.

[17] Mansi, 13, 208–356.

C — The Seventh General Council

During the short reign of Leo IV (775–780), who had succeeded Constantine Copronymus, the persecution practically ceased; and when on his death the Empress Irene was appointed regent for her infant son, the work of restoration commenced. The new patriarch, Tarasius, was a staunch defender of image veneration and made a strenuous effort to have the dispute finally settled by a general council. The Pope and the Empress both favored the patriarch's proposal, and after several futile attempts to hold the sessions at Constantinople, it was finally decided to convoke the council at Nicæa. There, on the 24th of September, 787, about 330 bishops convened, under the presidency of Tarasius, the Pope being represented by the Archpriest Peter and the Abbot Peter. Two monks, John and Thomas, acted as representatives of the Eastern patriarchs, who, on account of the Arab invasion, were unable to communicate with Constantinople.

Eight sessions were held, of which only three are of any dogmatic interest. In the second session the Pope's letters to Irene and Tarasius were read, and the latter declared that the doctrine contained therein should be accepted. In the fourth session passages were cited from Holy Scripture and the Fathers, whereby the lawfulness of invoking the saints and of venerating their images was proved. Finally it was decided that not only the images of the cross, but also those of the Saviour, of His Blessed Mother, and of the angels and the saints, should be exposed publicly, and that such veneration should be paid them as was due to the persons represented. The *cultus latriæ*, or divine worship, must be paid to God alone; but such other signs of religious veneration as kissing the images, lighting lamps before them, and burning incense, are rightly applicable to the representations of God's saints, as they are also applied to the venerable cross and the holy Gospels: for the honor paid to the image is referred to the original.[18]

These decisions of Nicæa officially closed the ecclesiastical

[18] Mansi, 12, 13.

dispute concerning the veneration of images, but it took about half a century longer before the disturbances caused by it entirely disappeared. Some of the subsequent Emperors followed more or less in the footsteps of Leo the Isaurian and Constantine Copronymus. Leo V (813–820) was especially fierce in his opposition to the Council, which was, however, strongly defended by the Patriarch Nicephorus and Theodore Studita. Conditions were almost as bad under Theophilus (829–842); but after his death, Patriarch John Hylilas held a synod at Constantinople, which accepted the decisions of Nicæa and anathematized the Iconoclasts, and with this the hundred years' war against the images came to a close in the East.

Meanwhile, however, trouble arose in the West. This was first occasioned by a defective translation of the Acts of Nicæa, which had been sent to Charlemagne in 788. Touching the veneration of images, it stated: "I receive and honorably cherish the holy and venerable images according to the worship of adoration, which I pay the consubstantial and vivifying Trinity; and whoso are not of a like mind, nor glorify (the sacred images), I segregate from the Holy and Apostolic Church and anathematize"; whereas the original had: "I accept and reverently kiss the holy and venerable images; but latreutical worship I reserve exclusively for the supersubstantial and vivifying Trinity."

In repudiation of the doctrine as set forth in the faulty translation, Charlemagne sent a number of *Capitula* to Pope Hadrian, pointing out how the Council had blundered into a most lamentable error. The Pope finally cleared up matters by a detailed answer to the *Capitula*, in which he says that the teaching of the Council is in perfect conformity with the doctrine of his predecessor and with his own, since it decrees that images should be venerated by kisses and salutations, but that divine worship should be paid to God alone.[19] And therefore, he adds, did we receive the Council. Thus the misunderstanding was indeed removed, but Charlemagne and his Franks

[19] Mansi, 13, 808; P. G. 98, 1291.

refused to come to terms. They approved of the use of images for decorative purposes, and also for instruction, but would have nothing to do with their veneration. This hostile attitude continued until after the Eighth General Council (869), which approved the decision of Nicæa.

Sometimes the Synod of Frankfort (794) is also adduced as opposed to the veneration of images, but this is a mistake; for the assembled bishops simply condemned the doctrine contained in the erroneous translation sent to Charlemagne, as appears from their own words: "The question was also raised concerning a recent Greek synod, which they held at Constantinople in regard to the adoration of images, and in the Acts of which it is written that those who do not worship and adore the images of the saints, as they worship and adore the vivifying Trinity, should be adjudged anathema." [20] This adoration of images they reject, but they do not touch the question of simple veneration as defined by the Council. It may be added that the synod of Constantinople, here mentioned, is the same as that of Nicæa; the confusion of names being due to the fact that the last session was held at Constantinople.

[20] Mansi, 13, 909.

CHAPTER XXXIII

THE FILIOQUE CONTROVERSY: SPANISH ADOPTIONISM: THE EIGHTH GENERAL COUNCIL[1]

John Damascene (+ 754) and Isidore of Seville (+ 636) are usually considered as the last of the Fathers. With them Patristic theology came to a close. Neither of them contributed much of his own to the elucidation of theological questions, but both did good service in gathering together what their more gifted predecessors had worked out with patient skill during the ages that were past. Furthermore, they prepared the way for a new theology, that was to take its rise some three centuries later. Hence they stand, as it were, at the parting of the ways — harking back to the Patristic past and foreshadowing the Scholastic future.

Yet this new theology was slow in forming. There was no particular dearth of great men, who under more favorable circumstances might have made their own age as brilliant as any that went before in the history of theological development; but the confusion and disturbances that followed the irruption of Northern nations into the Roman Empire, together with the ecclesiastical dissensions between the East and the West, prevented them from doing more than to preserve the precious heirloom of past ages. Hence the eighth, the ninth, and the tenth centuries present little that is of real value to the History of Dogmas. We may, therefore, conclude this first volume with a few remarks on the last phases of the great Trinitarian and Christological controversies, as they appeared in the Filioque dispute and Spanish Adoptionism. A word or two on the Eighth General Council seems also in place.

[1] Cfr. Hefele, IV, 384–436, 2nd Germ. Edit. Tixeront, H. D. III, 501–523. Hergenroether, Photius, I; Marion, Histoire, de l'Eglise, I, 639–649; Hergenroether, Kirchengeschichte, II, 131–146.

A — The Filioque Controversy

Although the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son did not become a matter of controversy before the middle of the eighth century, still it had given rise to a diversity of opinions some time before that date. From the end of the fourth century forward, two opposite views gradually developed, one of which became peculiar to the East and the other to the West. All indeed were agreed that the Holy Ghost was the Spirit of the Father and of the Son; also that He proceeded from the Father through the Son; but how was this latter term, "through the Son," to be understood? It was on this point that views began in course of time to differ. Whilst Eastern theologians, at least after the fifth century, became more and more inclined to ascribe all causality in the procession of the Holy Spirit to the Father, so that "through the Son" meant little more to them than identification of nature between the Son and the Holy Spirit, together with priority of procession or generation on the part of the Son; those of the West placed the causality of the Son in this respect on the same plane with that of the Father, so that the Holy Ghost was conceived by them to proceed equally from both as from one principle of spiration. In this there was obviously not a mere question of terminology, but of doctrinal concepts as well.

However this difference of views between the East and West, as already stated, developed only in course of time. The fourth-century Eastern writers use expressions that may be interpreted either way, though the majority are undoubtedly in favor of deriving the Holy Spirit immediately from the Son. Thus Cyril of Jerusalem says that "the Father gives to the Son, and the Son communicates to the Holy Spirit";[2] and Didymus, commenting on John, 16, 13, paraphrases the words of Christ concerning the mission of the Holy Ghost in this manner: "For He shall not speak of Himself, that is, without me and without the Father's direction, as He is inseparable from mine and the Father's will. Because He is not of Him-

[2] Cat. 16, 24.

self, but from the Father and from me. For His very subsistence comes to Him from the Father and from me." [3] Epiphanius is equally clear: "Christ is held to be of the Father, God of God, and the Holy Ghost is of Christ, or of both, as Christ says: 'He proceeds from the Father,' and, 'He shall receive of me.'" [4] And to the question, why is not the Spirit also the Son of the Father, he replies: "Who are you that you should contradict God? For if He calls Him Son who is of Himself, and Him the Holy Ghost who is of both," is not that sufficient? [5] "Furthermore, the Holy Spirit is of both, Spirit of Spirit, for God is Spirit." [6] Athanasius usually speaks of the Holy Spirit as proceeding immediately from the Son. Thus: "The Spirit is said to proceed from the Father, because He flashes forth from the Logos, who is admitted to be of the Father." [7] Basil states that "the Son bears the same relation to the Father as the Holy Ghost bears to the Son," [8] although in another place he says that the Holy Ghost comes "from the Father through the Only-Begotten." [9] Finally, Chrysostom interprets the expression "per Filium" to have in this connection the same meaning as "ex Filio": "If the term 'per ipsum' is used, it is for no other reason than to prevent that any one should suspect the Son to be unbegotten." [10]

Gregory of Nyssa, on the other hand, was later on adduced by Greek writers as authority for the view that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father alone. The passage usually pointed to runs as follows: "While firmly adhering to the identity of nature, we do not deny the distinction between the principle and what proceeds from it. We find this distinction between them; we believe that one is the principle and that the other is from the principle, and in what is from the principle we find another distinction. For the one is from the first immediately, the other only mediately and through that which is immediately from the first, so that the character-

[3] De Spir. Sanct. 34.
[4] Ancorat. 67.
[5] Ibid. 71.
[6] Panar. 7.
[7] Epist. I ad Serap. 20.
[8] De Spir. Sanct. 43, 47.
[9] Ibid. 47.
[10] Hom. 5 in Joan. 2.

istic note of Only-Begotten belongs undoubtedly to the Son. On the other hand it is certain that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, for while the mediation of the Son preserves for Him the character of Only-Begotten, His natural relation to the Father does not exclude the Holy Spirit." [11]

If this be taken as it stands, it may, of course, be interpreted in the sense that the Father is the sole principle of the Holy Spirit, since "it is certain that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father," and since "one is the principle," and the others are from the principle. But if it be borne in mind that the Son is said to be "immediately" from the Father, and the Holy Ghost "only mediately" and through the Son, there seems to be also solid reason for the opposite interpretation; especially if it be recollected that according to the statement of Chrysostom, cited above, "through the Son" had among the Greeks of that period the same significance as "from the Son." Furthermore, in another place he expresses the common view rather clearly, when he says that the Holy Spirit "is from God and of Christ, as it is written, in this way that He does not share either with the Father in the property of not proceeding, or with the Son in the property of the Only-Begotten." [12]

During the following century the two views are found existing side by side in the works of Eastern writers, but in some places there is already noticeable a growing preference for the opinion attributed to Gregory of Nyssa. This is especially true of the followers of the Antiochene school of theology. Thus whilst Cyril of Alexandria clearly teaches that the Holy Spirit "is in the Son, and from the Son," [13] that He is the Spirit "of the Father and of the Son, and is substantially from both"; [14] Theodoret of Cyrus seems equally clear in advocating the contrary view. Replying to the ninth anathematism of Cyril, in which the Holy Ghost is said to be the Spirit of Christ, he says: "If he means that the Holy Spirit has the same nature as the Son and proceeds from the

[11] Ad Alab. versus finem.
[12] Adv. Macedon. 2.
[13] De Trin. Dial. 7.
[14] De Adorat. in Spir. et Ver. 1, 9.

Father, we shall confess the same and receive it as a pious statement; but if he holds that the Holy Spirit has his subsistance from the Son or through the Son, we reject it as blasphemous and impious." [15] It has however been suggested that Theodoret, in making this severe stricture, had in mind the teaching of the Macedonians, according to which the Holy Spirit was to be regarded as a creature of the Son. This may be so, but it does not appear very probable.[16] At all events, the same view, that the Holy Spirit did not receive His existence from the Son, is put forth by the author of a symbol which was rejected by the Council of Ephesus, and which is usually supposed to have been written by Theodore of Mopsuestia, the master of Theodoret.[17]

Still with all this, the older and common teaching continued to hold its ground in the East, at least in orthodox circles. For when in the first part of the sixth century, Pope Hormisdas stated in a letter to the Emperor that the Holy Spirit "proceeded from the Father and the Son, *sub una substantia deitatis,*" [18] the expression apparently excited no comment. But about a hundred and thirty years later, when Martin I used a similar expression in a letter to the Monothelites, he was immediately accused of heterodoxy. Abbot Maximus tried to defend him, but he did so by more or less explaining away the obnoxious expression. The Romans, he said, when using the phrase "ex Filio," did not mean to assert that the Son was really the cause of the Holy Spirit, since the Father alone is properly speaking the cause of the other two persons; but thereby they simply wished to indicate that the Holy Spirit was "per Filium," and had the same substance as the Son.[19] He states his own view by saying that the Holy Ghost "proceeds substantially and ineffably from the Father through the Son." [20]

St. John Damascene appears to have taken a somewhat intermediate position, in so far as the use of terms comes in

[15] Mansi, 5, 124.
[16] Cfr. Hergenroether, Photius, I, 686.
[17] Mansi, 4, 1347.
[18] Epist. 79 ad Justin.
[19] P. G. 91, 133, 136.
[20] Ad Thalass; P. G. 90, 672.

question. For on the one hand he states repeatedly that the Holy Spirit cannot be said to proceed from the Son, but must be held to proceed from the Father through the Son;[21] yet on the other hand he calls Him the Spirit of the Son, the image of the Son, and says that He is communicated by the Son,[22] and therefore in some way necessarily proceeding from the Son. Hence the most likely inference is that he regarded the Father as the sole cause in the sense that He alone is the principle of the Trinity, the productive activity of the Son being derived from the Father. This would in effect be the same view as that taken by the Latins, only it is expressed in different terms. Nevertheless it is especially to John Damascene that the Greek schismatics appeal as an authority for rejecting the *Filioque* doctrine of the Western Church.

Whilst the East was thus gradually drifting away from the teaching of its great Fathers, concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son, the West placed that doctrine in an ever clearer light. Tertullian had coined the phrase, "a Patre per Filium," but he added almost immediately, "a Deo et Filio, sicut tertius a radice fructus a frutice";[23] thus obviously ascribing some casuality to the Son in the production of the Holy Spirit, although with a certain subordination to the Father. The same two expressions, "a Patre per Filium," and "a Patre et Filio," were used almost indiscriminately by subsequent writers, yet so as to make it clear that they looked upon the Son as an active principle along with the Father. Thus whilst Hilary terminates his prayer at the close of his great work *De Trinitate* with the words, "through Thy Holy Spirit, who is from Thee through Thy Only-Begotten,"[24] in the body of the work he states quite plainly that the Holy Spirit "must be held to be from the Father and the Son."[25] And commenting on the words of Christ as recorded in St. John, 16, 15, "He (the Paraclete) shall receive of mine," he says that to receive of the Son is the same as to receive of the Father; "nec differt a quo accep-

[21] De Fide Orthod. I, 8; I, 12; Hom. in Sabb. Sanct.; P. G. 96, 605.
[22] De Fide Orthod. I, 13; I, 8.
[23] Adv. Prax. 4, 8.
[24] Op. cit. 12, 57.
[25] Ibid. 29; P. L. 10, 69.

tum sit, quod datum a Patre, datum referatur a Filio." [26] Victorinus also puts this quite clearly, when he says: "The Holy Spirit is from the Son, as the Son is from the Father; and similarly the Holy Spirit is also from the Father." [27] Ambrose advances the same view. "According to the Sacred Scriptures," he argues, "the Holy Spirit is neither of the Father alone, nor of the Son alone, but of both." [28] And again: "The Holy Spirit also, since He proceeds from the Father and the Son, is not separated from the Father, is not separated from the Son." [29] Similar expressions are used by the other writers of this period. As already pointed out in a previous chapter, it was St. Augustine who formulated the doctrine in exact terms, emphasizing the fact that the Father and the Son are but one principle of spiration." [30] It was in this form that the doctrine was set forth by subsequent writers in the West.

From the sixth century forward, the expression "Filioque," or its equivalent, "a Patre et Filio," occurs not rarely in professions of faith as embodying the common teaching of the Church. Perhaps the earliest instance is that of the *Quicumque,* or so-called Athanasian Symbol, a fifth-century Western formula which became very popular after the seventh century. However it was not until 589, after the Council of Toledo, that an attempt was made to introduce the *Filioque* clause into the Liturgy. It was this that finally occasioned the controversy in the West, and incidentally accentuated the already existing differences between the Latin and the Greek Church.

The Council of Toledo, just referred to, was held on the occasion of the solemn abjuration of Arianism by the Gothic king Reccared and his subjects. The king first recited a profession of faith composed by himself, and then added the Nicene and Constantinopolitan Creeds, inserting into the latter the clause: "Credimus et in Spiritum Sanctum dominum et vivificantem, ex Patre et Filio procedentem." The assem-

[26] De Trin. 7, 20.
[27] Adv. Arium, 1, 13.
[28] De Spir. Sanct. 1, 11.
[29] Ibid.
[30] De Trin. 15, 29.

bled bishops approved the addition, "et Filio," and at the instance of the king ordered the Creed thus completed to be recited during Mass, immediately before the Pater Noster, as was the practice among the Greeks.[31]

About a century later the addition was also admitted into the Gallican liturgy, but was assigned its place in the preface. It appeared about the same time in England, closing the synodal letter of the council of Heathfield, held in 680.[32] This council was presided over by Theodore of Canterbury, who had formerly been a monk at Tarsus in Cilicia, and was therefore of Eastern origin and training.

Towards the close of the eighth century, the Greek custom of reciting the Creed during Mass had also been established in France, and in the Creed thus recited the Spanish addition was inserted. A few years later, Paulinus of Aquileia introduced the recitation of the amended Creed into the churches of Upper Italy, "on account of those who say that the Holy Spirit is only of the Father and proceeds from the Father alone." [33] Who these persons were, Paulinus does not state, but the inference is that he alluded to the Greeks. They were also attacked by Charlemagne in a letter to Pope Hadrian. Referring to a profession of faith read by the Patriarch Tarasius at the Seventh General Council, he says that Tarasius does not think rightly of the Holy Spirit, in as much as he declares him to proceed, not from the Father and the Son, according to the Nicene Symbol, but from the Father through the Son.[34] Of course, the Nicene Symbol here referred to is the amended form issued by the Council of Toledo.

Meanwhile trouble had arisen in Palestine, where a colony of Latin monks established at Bethlehem chanted the Creed at Mass with the addition of the *Filioque*. When the Greeks heard of this they treated them as heretics, and threatened to expel them unless they stopped the innovation. The monks thereupon appealed to Leo III, asking for instruction on the matter and pleading as an excuse for their conduct the precedent established by Charles in his own royal chapel. In

[31] Mansi, 9, 981.
[32] P. L. 95, 199.
[33] P. L. 99, 283, 293.
[34] Ibid. 87, 1220.

answer the Pope sent them a profession of faith, addressed also to the whole Eastern Church, in which he affirmed the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son, without, however, pressing the point.[35] He also apprised Charles of the occurrence, who then commissioned Theodulphus of Orleans to write a treatise on the Holy Spirit. This treatise, in which the *Filioque* is defended, was approved by the Synod of Aix-la-Chapelle in 809.

After the Synod Charles sent the bishop of Worms and the abbots of Corbie and Saint Mihiel to the Pope, in order to obtain from him a formal authorization for the chanting of the Creed with the addition of the *Filioque*. They presented the Acts of the synod, together with a treatise on the Holy Ghost written by the abbot Smaragdus. The Pope received them graciously, and fully approved of the doctrine, but he refused to give the petitioned authorization. He added, however, that as the practice had already been introduced in France, he could not very well do anything else than let things go their way.[36] His immediate successors took the same stand, tolerating the recitation of the Creed during Mass in places where the practice had been introduced, but refusing to give their official approbation. Finally, however, in 1014, Benedict VIII, at the instance of St. Henry of Germany, gave his formal consent and thereby the Spanish custom won the day.[37]

The real reason why the different Popes, though strongly approving the doctrine, refused to give any official recognition to the insertion of the *Filioque* into the Creed, must be looked for in the hostile attitude of the Eastern Church. As already pointed out, the theologians of the East gradually departed from the more common teaching of the fourth-century Fathers, and by the time the controversy was started in the West, they were inclined to look upon the *Filioque* clause as heretical. Hence as there were not wanting strong indications that the Greek Church was wavering in its allegiance and submission to Rome, the Popes deemed it prudent to abstain from adding anything to the accepted Creed. Events that happened a few

[35] Ibid. 102, 1030.
[36] Ibid. 102, 1071.
[37] Ibid. 142, 1060, 1061.

decades later showed the wisdom of their ways, although that wisdom was not sufficient to prevent the final schism.

B — Spanish Adoptionism

At the time when this heresy first appeared, Spain was politically divided into three parts. In the center and the south was the kingdom of the Moors with Cordova as its capital. In the northwest lay the small native kingdom of Oviedo. In the northeast extended the duchies of Navarre and Gothia, belonging to the empire of Charlemagne. It was in the first of these three divisions, the kingdom of the Moors, that the trouble originated. The author was Elipandus, then Archbishop of Toledo, a haughty old man and noted for his violent temper. In a letter addressed to a certain bishop Migetius, who seems to have taught that God the Father had become incarnate in David, the Son in the man Jesus, and the Holy Ghost in the Apostle Paul, he wrote: "We do not believe that the Son, whom you assert to be equal to the Father and the Holy Spirit, is He who in these latter times was made of the seed of David according to the flesh; but He rather who was born of the Father before the beginning of time, and who, before assuming flesh, said through the Prophet: Before the hills were was I brought forth." [38]

Somewhat later, Elipandus wrote concerning this matter to Felix, bishop of Urgel in Gothia, a young but learned prelate. Felix was of the same mind, and so the two began to spread their views far and wide, through Languedoc, Galitia, and the Asturias. Many bishops joined them, asserting indeed that the Son as Word was consubstantial with the Father, and that under this aspect He was God's natural Son; but they maintained at the same time that Christ's human nature, though truly assumed by the Word in the unity of person, did not share in this divine sonship; that Christ as man, therefore, must be regarded as God's adopted son. The Saviour's natural sonship they admitted quite rightly to be founded on His

[38] Epist. ad Miget. 7; P. L. 96, 863; cfr. Hefele, op. cit. 628 sqq.

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

eternal generation, but His adopted sonship they based on the communication of grace.[39]

It seems, however, that this theory was fully developed only by Felix, who took adoption in a juridical rather than in a physical sense. According to him it was not the hypostatic union, but sanctifying grace from which the adoption resulted. In this respect, therefore, Christ as man is in the same category with other just men, except that He received sanctifying grace in a higher degree. As man He is truly a servant, and the Word is the master of that servant. As man He did not have perfection of knowledge, was not impeccable, had need of regeneration, and in general resembled those who are only in a wider sense sons of God. Sonship, according to Felix and his followers, is predicated not of the person, but of nature; and hence, although there is only one person in Christ, still there are two sons.[40]

In all this there is obviously a recrudescence of Nestorianism, notwithstanding the assertion that Christ is only one person. It is commonly supposed that these heterodox ideas had been derived from the works of Theodore of Mopsuestia and of other Eastern writers of the same school, which the Mussulmen had adapted to their own views and brought with them into Spain.

As these views were directly opposed to the teaching of the Fathers, and also to the definitions of Ephesus and Chalcedon, they were immediately attacked by many orthodox writers in Spain and abroad. The first to raise their voices in protest were Heterius, bishop of Osma, and Beatus, abbot of Libana in the Asturias. A letter of the two addressed to Elipandus is still extant. Paulinus of Aquileia, Alcuin, Agobard, and many others entered the lists in defense of the faith. Pope Hadrian also addressed a strong letter to the bishops of Spain, designating the teaching of Elipandus and Felix as a blasphemy which no heresiarch had ever dared to utter, save only the perfidious Nestorius.[41] All this, however, had little effect.

[39] Apud Agobard. Lib. adv. Felic, 16, 15; Symbol. Fid. Elip.; P. L. 96, 917; cfr. Tixeront, op. cit. 512, 513.

[40] Alcuin, Adv. Felic. 2, 14; 3, 3; 6, 3, 4.

[41] P. L. 98, 374.

Then Charlemagne intervened and cited Felix before a synod at Ratisbon. He appeared, and although his teaching, as explained by himself, was condemned, he was allowed to return to his own diocese, after he had made a retractation of his errors.[42] But in a short time he relapsed, and began anew to spread his heterodox views. He retracted a second time before the Synod of Aix-la-Chapelle, in 799.[43] Then he was given into the custody of Leidrad, bishop of Lyons in France, and for the rest of his days he conformed in everything to the teaching of the Church, even going so far as to compose a work in refutation of the errors of his former associates. However after his death a document was found among his writings in which he retracted his retractation, and so it appears that his conversion was only a matter of expediency, or that he relapsed into his former errors. Elipandus, protected by the Moors, persisted in his heterodox views till death. With his passing the heresy gradually died out, although traces of it were found as late as the middle of the ninth century.

In passing it may be mentioned that the Adoptionists, and more especially their leader Felix, endeavored to enforce their teaching by arguments drawn from a variety of sources. Holy Scripture, the works of the Fathers, and the very definitions of Councils were laid under contribution. According to Scripture Christ is both the Son of God and the son of David; yet this, it was contended, is intelligible only on the assumption that as man He was the son of David by generation and the Son of God by adoption. Patristic texts, especially those drawn from the works of Augustine, making Christ as man the object of gratuitous predestination, lead to the same conclusion. And so, too, do the definitions of Councils to the effect that there are two distinct natures in Christ; for where there are two natures there must be two sons. However their opponents made short work of these and similar arguments, as may be gathered from such of their works as are still extant.[44] And in a discussion with Alcuin, which lasted for

[42] Mansi, 12, 1031.
[43] Ibid. 13, 1035–1040.
[44] Cfr. Alcuin and Paulinus, P. L. 101, 87–230; 99, 243–468; 96, 883.

several days, Felix confessed himself completely worsted by his opponent.[45]

Of the many synods that were convened to extirpate Adoptionism, that of Frankfort on the Main, held in 794, has obtained the greatest celebrity. It was presided over by the Papal legates, and defined that in virtue of the hypostatic union there is in Christ only one Son of God, not an adopted son, but the Son of God by nature. About two years later this was approved by Hadrian I, and again by Leo III, in 799, in a council held at Rome.[46]

Thus the last Christological error was authoritatively condemned. It was the condemnation of this error that completed the Church's teaching on the person of Christ. Although the God-Man's human soul was perfected by sanctifying grace, and although sanctifying grace ordinarily results in divine adoption, nevertheless, because in Him the divine and the human are hypostatically united, such an adoption is impossible in His case. The proper object of adoption is not nature as such, but nature perfected by its own personality; in this case, therefore, it would be a human person extraneous to the Godhead, a supposition that evidently divides Christ. Hence the definition of Frankfort only stated explicitly what was already implicitly contained in the definition of Ephesus. Christ is one person, and therefore necessarily one Son of God.

C — The Eighth General Council

This Council was, in the first instance, not convoked to settle any doctrinal dispute, but rather to bring some sort of order out of the chaos that had resulted from the intrusion of Photius into the patriarchal see of Constantinople. Ignatius, the lawful patriarch, had been deposed by Michael the Drunkard, on account of his uncompromising stand against the scandalous proceedings at the imperial court. After his deposition the government offered the see to Photius, the secretary of state and captain of the life guard. As he was still a layman, he

[45] Alcuin, Epist. 117; cfr. P. L. 96, 883; Mansi, 13, 1035 sqq.

[46] Mansi, 13, 1031, 1032.

thereupon hurriedly received all the orders, and on Christmas day, 857, was consecrated patriarch by Gregory Asbestas, the excommunicated metropolitan of Syracuse in Sicily. Ignatius was thrust into prison, but although shamefully abused, he could not be induced to resign his see.

Meanwhile Photius, the Emperor, and the Cæsar Bardas, who was the ruling power behind the throne, tried to have these proceedings ratified by Rome; but unfortunately for their well laid plans, the Roman See was then occupied by a man whom contemporary writers very appropriately styled "a second Elias." This was Nicholas I. Although his own legates, misinformed perhaps of the true state of things, confirmed all that had been done, he himself did not rest until he had found out the whole truth, and then without ceremony deposed the intruder. The result was a schism, which lasted till 867, when Michael the Drunkard was murdered, and his successor, Basil I, sent Photius into banishment and recalled Ignatius. Almost the first act of the reinstated patriarch was to ask for a council, so that all the previous difficulties might be authoritatively settled. In this he was seconded by Basil, who forthwith despatched letters and envoys to Rome, for the purpose of inducing the Pope to accede to the patriarch's request.

Whilst these changes were going on, Pope Nicholas died, and was succeeded by Hadrian II, a man of almost equal ability and strength of character. He assembled a provincial synod at Rome, in which Photius was condemned for having attempted to excommunicate Pope Nicholas. On the same occasion Papal legates for the contemplated general council were appointed. The men chosen were Donatus, bishop of Ostia, Stephen, bishop of Nepi, and a deacon, Marinus by name. They arrived at Constantinople during the month of September, 869, and the Council opened in the *Hagia Sophia* on October the fifth. The attendance was very small, only 192 bishops, including the patriarchs, were present. The Papal legates presided; next to them sat Ignatius, then the legates of the Patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem. The representatives from Alexandria did not arrive until the ninth session.

At the beginning of the first session the legates were asked

to show their credentials from the Pope, so as to prevent a recurrence of the trouble caused by the legates of Nicholas I; and when this was complied with, all the bishops and patriarchs present signed the formula of Hormisdas, which clearly states the Primacy of the Pope. In the next session penances were imposed upon the repentant bishops who had followed Photius in his schism. Photius himself, however, who was summoned during the fifth session, refused to give any satisfaction, and in consequence he was excommunicated anew by the Council.[47]

One of the many charges which Photius had brought against the Church of Rome, and by which he endeavored to justify his schism, was the doctrine involved in the *Filioque* clause. However the Council does not seem to have taken any notice of it; at least there is nothing in the records that points to a discussion of the matter. Possibly it was not considered a safe topic to bring up under existing conditions. Only two points were touched upon that are of any doctrinal importance. The first regards the unity of the human soul, and the second is a reaffirmation of the lawfulness of venerating sacred images. Both the Old and the New Testament, it is stated in the eleventh canon, teach that man has only one rational soul, and the same is also held by the Fathers and teachers of the Church. However whether this definition formally implies the identity of the vegetative and sensitive principle with the rational soul, does not appear from the wording of the canon; nor can this be determined to a certainty from anything we know about the purpose of the definition. Hence, because of this uncertainty, the definition loses much of its value for dogmatic purposes.

Another point of interest, although only historically so, is the implicit confirmation of the pretensions of Constantinople to the first place in the order of dignity after the see of Rome. If the Anastasian recension is to be trusted, the claim seems to have been allowed as a fact that could no longer be changed.

The tenth and last session of the Council was held on February 28, 870. Then the canons were read and approved by all the bishops present. The Acts of the Council were sol-

[47] Cfr. Mansi, 16, 308–409.

emnly confirmed by Pope Hadrian II, and the Council has ever since been regarded as ecumenical, although the Photian party refused to acknowledge its authority. The peace thus reëstablished between the East and the West lasted only for about ten years, but it is well to notice that the last General Council of the Church, in which both of these great divisions of Christendom participated, explicitly acknowledged the Primacy of Rome, notwithstanding the fact that the attending bishops were nearly all from the East.

CONCLUSION

Leaving aside now the advance made along the various lines of theological thought during the second and third centuries, as a brief summary of that has already been given, the following may be put down as the achieved results of five hundred years of doctrinal development.

In the East, Christian thought was at first almost exclusively occupied with the fundamental doctrines of the Holy Trinity. In opposition to the denial of Arius the Council of Nicæa defined the true divinity of the Son, but omitted, as then and there uncalled for, a like definition in reference to the Holy Ghost. The Arian controversy during the next fifty years was concerned primarily with the appositeness of the terms used in the Nicene definition, but secondarily it involved also doctrinal differences, as many of the dissenting bishops held Subordinationist views regarding the divinity of the Son. These differences were gradually eliminated by the patient labors of the great champions of orthodoxy during the fourth century.

The rise of Macedonianism towards the end of the Arian controversy, and the dangers to the Trinitarian faith connected therewith, called for an explicit definition of the divinity of the Holy Ghost, which was in due time issued by the Second General Council, held at Constantinople in 381. This completed the Church's teaching on the Blessed Trinity, at least in its most fundamental aspect — one God, three divine persons; numerically one divine nature, common by identity to

Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. The same Council also defined the perfect humanity of Christ, in so far at least as it condemned the teaching of Apollinaris, who held that Christ as man had no rational human soul.

This condemnation of Apollinarianism did not give a final solution of the Christological problem, which began to attract the attention of theologians towards the end of the fourth century. The traditional teaching of the Church had always clearly maintained these three points: Christ is God, Christ is man, Christ is one. Hence the question: How can Christ be one, if He is both God and man? That question still remained to be solved. Nestorius tried to solve it by having recourse to a moral union, thus breaking up the unity of person. After a somewhat protracted discussion between him and Cyril of Alexandria, his view was rejected as heretical by the Council of Ephesus in 431. As instructed by Pope Celestine, the Council defined that the divine and the human nature in Christ are so united as to result in one person, the person of the Word. Along with this was also defined the Divine Motherhood of Mary, she being declared to be truly Theotokos, truly the Mother of God.

This definition of the unity of person in Christ, although it sufficiently safeguarded the distinction of natures, nevertheless emboldened the followers of Cyril to emphasize the union to such an extent as to speak of a physical confusion or mingling of the two elements in Christ. To counteract this extreme view, championed especially by Eutyches, the Council of Chalcedon, in 451, as directed by Pope Leo, defined the integrity and distinction of the natures, pointing out that the union between them is hypostatic.

This should have been a sufficient solution of the Christological problem, but it was not. Sergius of Constantinople revived Eutychianism in another form, maintaining that the human will in Christ was so subordinated to the divine as to be deprived of its own proper activity. Against him and his many followers the Sixth General Council, held at Constantinople in 681, defined, in accordance with instructions received from Pope Agatho, that, as there are two perfect natures in

Christ, so are there also two perfect wills and two distinct operations, the one human and the other divine.

With this definition the Christological contentions in the East came to a close, but they were revived about a hundred years later in the West, when some Spanish bishops contended that Christ as man was only the adopted son of God. The Council of Frankfort, approved by Pope Hadrian I, condemned this teaching as heretical, in 794, and thereby put the finishing touch to the Church's doctrine on the person of Christ. It was also in the West that the Trinitarian problem received its final solution, in as much as the doctrine concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son was there inserted in the Creed and thus became an article of the faith.

It must be noted that in the development of these fundamental doctrines, which, with the two minor exceptions just mentioned, were discussed almost exclusively in the East, it was invariably the West, speaking through the Pope, that determined the final decision. The East could and did raise many problems, but it was only Rome that was able to provide a satisfactory solution.

Whilst the East was thus occupied with questions touching the Blessed Trinity and the Incarnation, the West turned its attention to the eminently practical consideration of man's condition here on earth and his relation to God. The naturalism of Pelagius met with strong opposition from St. Augustine, whose teaching on original sin and the necessity of divine grace was, in part at least, adopted by the Church and sanctioned by her for all times. On the other hand, his perhaps somewhat extreme views on the total depravity of sin-stained nature and on predestination found a counter-poise in the writings of the Semi-Pelagians, whose aberrations on the sufficiency of the natural free will for the beginning of faith and salutary works were indeed condemned by the Church, yet they helped to bring out the true teaching on man's present condition, as formulated by the second Council of Orange in 529.

In opposition to the Donatists, St. Augustine also strongly

defended the traditional views on the Church and her sacraments, clarifying concepts which had till then been somewhat hazy, and formulating ecclesiological and sacramentary teaching with a precision that remained unsurpassed for many centuries. The nature of the sacraments, the conditions required for their validity, the sacramental character, were some of the chief points to which he devoted his attention in course of these controversies. Aside from this, he likewise contributed very much to the development of eschatological teaching, correcting some of the views of his predecessors, and developing the doctrine to such an extent that it has continued practically in the same condition till the present time.

Besides these particular doctrines, which, owing mostly to heretical vagaries, were more fully evolved, considerable development took place along nearly every line of theological thought. The Real Presence, Transubstantiation, the sacrificial character of the Mass, the efficacy of the Holy Sacrifice for the living and the dead, were by the end of the seventh century as clearly understood and as definitely taught as they are to-day. Penance, too, from the sixth century forward, appeared under its present form, whilst during the preceding centuries it had retained much of its primitive character. The same must be said about matrimony, both as regards canonical impediments and indissolubility, especially in the West. In the fifth century extreme unction appears as a well established religious rite, and a little later is often referred to in the legislation of bishops and provincial synods. The doctrine of purgatory was already definitely formulated by St. Augustine, and has received hardly any further development up to the present time.

A similar statement applies to the veneration of saints, which since the fourth century included virgins and confessors as well as martyrs. The veneration of images was of slower growth, but by the end of the seventh century it had become practically universal. Its lawfulness was doctrinally defined by the Seventh General Council in 787. Devotion to the Mother of God, which had indeed been in favor from the first, became more intense after the Council of Ephesus, and by the

ninth century had given rise to a considerable number of feasts, among which was that of the Immaculate Conception, although it was then not yet understood in precisely the same sense as we understand it to-day.

It is hardly necessary to remark that in all this progress and development the Church was ever conscious of being guided by the Holy Spirit. She saw the mustard seed of divine truth grow up into a great tree, but she was perfectly aware that in all its growth there was no change in kind. In root and trunk and branches, it ever was and still remained the self-same tree.

INDEX

Abercius, Inscription of: refers to baptism, the Eucharist, the universality of the Church, and prayers for the dead, 135, 136.
Acacius of Cæsarea: head of the Acacian heretics, 245.
Acacius of Constantinople: author of the Acacian schism, 413.
Acemeti, monks: attack the formula, "unus ex Trinitate crucifixus est," 414.
Adam, primitive condition and fall of: teaching of the Old Testament, 23; of the Apologists, 129; Irenæus, 145, 304; Clement of Alexandria, 191; the 4th century writers, 302–306; Augustine, 307, 372, 373. Harnack's view, 303.
Adamantius: his teaching on the Trinity, 214; the Church, 214.
Adoptionism: in Hermas, 75; of the Monarchism heretics, 153–155; Paul of Samosata, 155; Spanish Adoptionism, 498–501.
Aërius: denies the efficacy of suffrages for the dead, 454.
Agatho, Pope: condemns the Monothelite heresy, 428, 429; his letter to the 6th General Council, 429; is acclaimed by the Council, 430.
Alcuin: opposes Spanish Adoptionism, 499, 500.
Alexander of Alexandria: convenes a synod against Arius, 222; his teaching on the Logos, 222, 223.
Allegorism: of the Hellenic Jews, 32; Clement of Alexandria, 197; Origen, 208.
Alogi: a second century heretical sect, 158.
Ambrose of Milan: his life and writings, 233; his teaching on God, 258; the Trinity, 269; procession of the Holy Spirit, 269; Christology, 314; the redemption, 321; the angels, 295, 297; sacramental character, 344; symbolism, 343, 344; baptism in the name of Jesus, 351; power of the keys, 352, note; Eucharistic conversion, 353, 354; original sin, 363; necessity of grace, 372; grace of adoption, 306; Mary's virginity, 444; purgatory, 454; eternity of hell, 460.
Ambrosiaster: on original sin, 361; divorce, 355.
Amphilochius of Iconium: life and writings, 231; his teaching on the Trinity, 266; procession of the Holy Spirit, 266; Christology, 308–312.
Andrew of Samosata: attacks the anathematisms of Cyril, 396.
Angelology: of the Old Testament, 22, 23; Philo, 32; Hermas, 97; the Apologists, 127; Origen, 202, 299; 4th cent. writers, 293–299; the Pseudo-Areopagite, 295, 296; Gregory I, 296. Creation of the angels, 297; their elevation, 297, 298; their fall, 298; their nature, 294, 295; orders and choirs, 296, 297; guardian angels, 299; demons, inciters to evil, 298, 299.
Anthropology: of the Old Testament, 23, 24; Philo, 32, 33; the Apologists, 127, 128; Clement of Alexandria, 195, 300; Origen, 202; Irenæus, 145; 4th cent. writers, 299–307; later writers, 465, 466.
Apelles: Gnostic heretic, 103.
Aphraates: life and writings, 232; his teaching on the judgment, 458.
Apollinaris: his teaching on the humanity of Christ, 249–251; condemned by the 2nd General Council, 251.
Apologists, second-century: their

writings, 110–113; defense of Christian morals, 113, 114; relation to pagan philosophy, 114, 115; exposition of Christian doctrine, 115–135; their teaching on the authority of Holy Scripture, 116; on God, 116–118; the Logos, 118–125; the Holy Ghost, 125, 126; the Trinity, 126, 127; creation, 117, 127; the angels, 127; the origin of the soul, 300; anthropology, 127, 128; the immortality of the soul, 128, 129; the redemption, 127; the Church, 129–133; baptism, 130; the Eucharist, 131, 132; Christology, 127; the Blessed Virgin, 133; original sin, 129; eschatology, 133.

Aristides: his apology, 111; defense of Christian morals, 113, 114; his teaching on God, 116; the Logos, 121.

Arius: his early life, 219, 220; his teaching on the Logos, 220; on God, 254; his condemnation, 225; banishment, 227; recall and death, 237. Arian reaction, 236, 237; its nature and causes, 237–240; outline of, 240–246.

Arles, council of: its ruling on rebaptism, 182.

Artemas: a Monarchian heretic, 155.

Asterius of Amasea: on the veneration of images, 479.

Athanasius of Alexandria: life and writings, 234; at the Council of Nicæa, 233; persecuted by the Eusebians, 233; appeals to Rome, 241, 328; at the Council of Sardica, 242; his teaching on the essence and attributes of God, 258; on the Trinity, 261, 262; procession of the Holy Spirit, 491; creation, 285–287; the angels, 298; Christology, 308, 309; the redemption, 319; the grace of Christ, 305; original sin, 360; Mary's virginity, 442.

Athenagoras: his apology, 111; his teaching on Holy Scripture, 112; the Logos, 120; the Trinity, 121.

Augustine of Hippo: life and writings, 234; his teaching on the existence of God, 258, 259; essence and attributes of God, 258–260; the Trinity, 270–274; divine persons, 272, 273; one principle of procession, 273, 274; origin of evil, 283, 284; creation, 288; God alone can create, 289; nature of creative work, 289; the rationes seminales, 290–292; the angels, 297, 298; origin of the soul, 301; original sin, existence of, 362, 363; nature of, 364; mode of transmission, 364, 365; effects of, 365, 366; Christology, 314–316; the redemption, 321, 322; Adam's primitive condition, 372, 373; the gratia justitiæ, 373, 374; the grace of adoption, 306, 307; the *auxilium quo et quo non*, 374; actual grace, 375; sufficient and efficacious grace, 375, 376; necessity and gratuitousness of grace, 377; predestination and reprobation, 377, 378; the Church, 332–337; notes of the Church, 333–335; primacy of the Pope, 335, 336; infallibility, 335, 336; the sacraments, 347–350; definition of, 347; institution by Christ, 348; number of, 350, 351; efficacy, 348, 349; conditions of fruitful reception, 445, 446; character, 350; the Eucharist, 352, 353; the power of the keys, 352, note; extreme unction, 355; Mary's holiness, 445; immaculate conception, 445, 446; purgatory, 454–456; the eternity of hell, 461, 462; communion of saints, 463.

Baptism: teaching of the New Testament, 38, 40, 42, 51; the Apostolic Fathers, 89, 91; the Apologists, 130; inscription of Abercius, 136; Irenæus, 146; Tertullian, 167; Cyprian, 178; Clement of Alexandria, 196; Origen, 205; 4th cent. writers, 351. Effects of baptism, 167, 178, 196, 369, 345; character, 341, 344; symbolism, 339, 343. Baptism of children, 146, 178, 167, 196, 205. Baptism of

blood, 167, 178, 351; of desire, 351.
Baptismal controversy, 180–183.
Basil of Ancyra: Semi-Arian leader, 244.
Basil the Great: life and writings, 229; his teaching on the essence and attributes of God, 256, 257; on the Trinity, 263, 264; the procession of the Holy Spirit, 264, 491; the nature of the angels, 294, 297; their elevation, 297; Adam's primitive condition, 319, 320; original sin, 360; the necessity of grace, 370; purgatory, 453; the veneration of images, 477.
Beatus of Libana: opposes Spanish Adoptionism, 499.
Bede, Venerable: bears witness to the Primacy, 470.
Boethius: defines nature and person, 435.
Boniface II, Pope: confirms the 2nd Council of Orange, 385.
Boniface of Mayence: his ruling on the administration of the last sacraments, 474.

Cæsarius of Arles: his efforts to end the Semi-Pelagian controversy, 385, 386; his classification of sins, 473; his teaching on purgatory, 456.
Callistus, Pope: condemns the Monarchian heresy, 156; his ruling on penance, 186, 187.
Carthage, council of: condemns Pelagianism, 369; approved by Pope Zozimus, 369.
Cassian, John: opposes the teaching of Augustine on grace, 379; his views on the beginning of good works, 380; on the nature of grace, 380, 381; on predestination and final perseverance, 381.
Cassiodorus: on the origin of the soul, 466; defines personality, 435.
Catacombs: their testimony to the veneration of saints and images, 477, 478.
Celestine I, Pope: is appealed to by Nestorius, 392; his teaching on the person of Christ, 392, 395; condemns Nestorius and makes Cyril his representative, 393; sends legates to the Council of Ephesus and instructs the Council, 396, 397.
Celestius: Pelagian heretic, 357; his preaching in Africa, 359.
Celsus: eclectic Platonist, 108; his "True Discourse," 108, 109.
Cerdo: Gnostic heretic, 102; applies for reconciliation, 103.
Cerinthus: Judaizing Gnostic, 85.
Chalcedon: council of, 404–407; instructed by Pope Leo, 405; condemns Eutyches and defines the duality of nature in Christ, 406; Creed of, 406.
Chapters, the Three: origin and meaning of, 416; controversy on, 417; condemned by the 5th General Council, 419; inconsistent conduct of Pope Vigilius, 417–421.
Character, sacramental: teaching of the Apostolic Fathers, 91; Tertullian, 344; later writers, 341, 344, 350.
Charlemagne: his attitude in reference to the veneration of images, 487; the Filioque clause, 496; Spanish Adoptionism, 500.
Children, baptism of: cfr. 146, 167, 178, 205.
Christology: of the Synoptists, 45–47; St. John, 47; St. Paul, 47–49; the Apostolic Fathers, 76–78; the Apologists, 127; Irenæus, 146; Hippolytus, 150; the Monarchian heretics, 154; Tertullian, 165; Novatian, 171; Clement of Alexandria, 195; Origen, 204; Paul of Samosata, 155; Arius, 221; Apollinaris, 249–251; 4th cent. writers, Greek, 308–312; Latin, 312–314; Augustine, 314–316; the Quicumque, 316; Cyril of Alexandria, 408, 411; Theodoret of Cyrus, 435–437; Theodore of Mopsuestia, 388, 389; Nestorius, 390–395; Leontius of Byzantium, 437–439; Abbot Maximus, 439–441.—Christ's

divinity before the Council of Nicæa, 46, 47, 48, 72–75, 127, 146, 150, 165, 166, 171, 195, 203, 211, 212, 213, 214, 226.— Unity of person and duality of nature before the 5th century Christological controversies, 77, 78, 127, 146, 150, 166, 171, 195, 294, 213, 214, 309, 311, 313, 315.— His human knowledge, 309, 310, 314; His sanctity, 310, 314.— Christological problem, 220, 221.

Chrysostom, John: life and writings, 231; his teaching on the procession of the Holy Spirit, 491; on creation, 286; original sin, 361; sacramental symbolism, 341; sacramental character, 341; the minister of the sacraments, 343; the effects of baptism, 369, 370; necessity of grace, 371; divorce, 356; purgatory, 454; the judgment, 457; beatific vision, 460; veneration of saints, 450.

Church, the: in the Synoptists, 36, 39; St. John, 39–41; St. Paul, 41–44; in Apostolic times, 51, 52; the Apostolic Fathers, 69, 70, 80–89; Apologists, 129–132; Hegesippus, 135; Irenæus, 141–145; Hippolytus, 151; Tertullian, 161, 167; Cyprian, 171–178; Clement of Alexandria, 196; Origen, 199, 205; Methodius, 210; Adamantius, 210; at the beginning of the 4th century, 218, 219; 4th cent. writers, Greek, 325–328; Latin, 328, 329; Optatus, 329–332; Augustine, 332–337; later writers, 468–470. Notes of the Church, 326, 330, 335, 468, 469. Independent of the State, 328; her teaching authority, 335, 69, 80, 81, 130, 131, 143, 172, 173, 214; her infallibility, 143, 335, 336.

Clement of Alexandria: life and writings, 190–194; his teaching on faith and gnosis, 192–194; the Logos, 194; the Holy Ghost, 195; the Trinity, 195; creation, 195; anthropology, 195; original sin, 195; Christology, 195, 196; the redemption, 196; the Church, 196, sacramental symbolism, 340; baptism, 196; the Eucharist, 196, 197; penance, 197, 188; matrimony, 197; eschatology, 197; on property, 194.

Clement of Rome: his letter to the Corinthians, 64, 65; his teaching on God and His attributes, 70, 71; the divinity of Christ, 72, 73; humanity of Christ, 77, 78; the redemption, 78, 79; the Church, 80, 83; the hierarchy, 82, 83; schism, 83; the Primacy, 82, 83; sacrifice, 92.

Communicatio Idiomatum: in the Apostolic Fathers, 78; in Gnostic writings, 104; the Apologists, 127; Irenæus, 146; Tertullian, 166; Origen, 204; Gregory of Nazianzus, 311; Zeno of Verona, 313; Theodore of Mopsuestia, 389; Nestorius, 395; Cyril of Alexandria, 395; Theodoret of Cyrus, 437.

Confession of sins: teaching of the Didache, 93; Pseudo-Barnabas, 184; Ignatius, 93; Secunda Clementis, 93; Cyprian, 179; Origen, 206; later writers, 352, 473.

Confirmation: in the Epistles of St. Paul, 42; the Acts, 52; Cyprian, 178; Tertullian, 167; 4th cent. writers, 340–344; Augustine, 347, 350; later writers, 472; Eucholgium of Serapion, 342; Greek formula, 342; symbolism of, 340, 343; character, 342, 344, 350.

Constantine the Great: gives peace to the Church, 229; his efforts to settle the Arian dispute, 223; present at the Council, 224; banishes Arius, and then recalls him, 227, 237; is baptized on his deathbed, 237.

Constantine Copronymus: proscribes image-veneration, 484.

Constantinople, councils of: 2nd General, condemns the Semi-Arian, Macedonian, and Apollinarian heresies, and defines the divinity of the Holy Ghost and the perfect humanity of Christ, 248–252.— 5th General, condemns the Three Chapters, 417–419.—6th

General, condemns the Monothelite heresy and defines the two wills in Christ, 428–431.—8th General, settles the dispute between Ignatius and Photius, and reaffirms the lawfulness of image-veneration, 501–504.
Councils, General: see place where they were held.
Conversion, Eucharistic: teaching of Justin Martyr, 132; Irenæus, 147; Origen, 207; 4th cent. writers, 353, 354; later writers, 472.
Creation, doctrine of: in the Old Testament, 22; Philo, 32; in the early Church, 284, 285; Hermas, 70; teaching of Athanasius, 285, 286; Chrysostom, 286; Hilary, 286, 287; Ephrem, 287; Augustine, 288–292; creation in time, 286; God created freely, 286, 289; God alone can create, 287, 289; the Trinity creates as one principle, 287, 288; Augustine's rationes seminales, 290–292.
Creed: Apostolic, 53; Nicene, 226; Constantinopolitan, 252; Athanasian, 274, 316; Union, 399; against the Monophysites, 406; the Monothelites, 430; in the liturgy, 495–498; as a rule of faith, in Irenæus, 141; Tertullian, 162; Origen, 199.
Cyprian of Carthage: life and writings, 171, 172; his teaching on original sin, 361; the constitution of the Church, 171–173; the hierarchy, 172, 173; episcopal authority, 173; provincial synods, 174; the Primacy, 174–177; the sacraments, 177, 178; sacramental character, 344; sacramental symbolism, 243; baptism of children, 178; of heretics, 178; confirmation, 178; the Eucharist, Real Presence, sacrifice, 178, 179; holy orders, 179; matrimony, 179. His part in the baptismal controversy, 180–183.
Cyril of Alexandria: his controversy with Nestorius, 391–393; appeals to the Pope, 394; presides at the Council of Ephesus, 396–400; his anathematisms, 394; relation to the Monophysites, 408–411; to the Monothelites, 412; his teaching on the procession of the Holy Spirit, 492; the redemption, 468; on grace, 305, 467; original sin, 467; veneration of images, 479.
Cyril of Jerusalem: life and writings, 229; his teaching on the procession of the Holy Spirit, 490; the Church, 325, 326; sacramental symbolism, 341, 342; Eucharistic conversion, 353; the epiclesis, 354; the grace of Christ, 305; purgatory, 453; the resurrection, 459.

Damascene, John: his position as a theological writer, 475; teaching on the procession of the Holy Spirit, 493; on grace, 306; the epiclesis, 354; veneration of images, 483, 484.
Damasus, Pope: condemns the teaching of Apollinaris, 251.
Didache, the: origin and contents of, 62–64; its teaching on God, 70, 71; the divinity of Christ, 72; the Trinity, 76; the Church, 87; the hierarchy, 87, 88; baptism, 90; the Eucharist, 91, 92; sacrifice, 93; confession of sins, 93; resurrection of the dead, 96.
Didymus the Blind: life and writings, 230; his teaching on the Trinity, 265; procession of the Holy Spirit, 266; origin of the soul, 300; trichotomy, 300; original sin, 360; Mary's virginity, 443.
Docetism: opposed by Ignatius, 77, 92; Polycarp, 77; in Gnostic writings, 102, 104.
Diodorus of Tarsus: life and writings, 231; his relation to Nestorianism, 388.
Diognetus, Letter to: its teaching on the divinity of Christ, 121; on the immortality of the soul, 128; the redemption, 317, 318.
Dionysius of Alexandria: reported to Rome on the charge of heresy, 211; his teaching on the Trinity, 212.

Dionysius of Corinth: his teaching on penance, 184, 188.
Dionysius, Pope: his letter to the bishop of Alexandria, 211; his teaching on the Trinity, 211.
Dioscorus of Alexandria: presides at the Robber Synod, 403; supports Eutyches, 404; excluded from the Council of Chalcedon, 405.
Divorce: in the Old Testament, 35; teaching of Origen, 207; 4th cent. writers, 355, 356; later writers, 475.
Dogma: derivation and meaning of the term, 1, 2; definition of dogma, 2; history of dogma, 2, 3, 4; development of dogmas during the first three centuries, 215–217; from the Council of Nicæa to the end of the Patristic age, 504–509.
Donatist Schism: origin and spread of, 323, 324.

Ecthesis: Monothelite profession of faith composed by Sergius of Constantinople, 426; condemned by Pope John IV, 427.
Elipandus of Toledo: author of Spanish Adoptionism, 498, 500.
Elvira, council of: on the veneration of images, 478.
Ephesus: council of, 396–400; instructed by Pope Celestine, 396; its use of the argument from the Fathers, 397; condemns Nestorius and declares Mary Theotokos, 398; opposition of John of Antioch, 398, 399.
Ephrem, the Syrian: life and writings, 238; his teaching on the procession of the Holy Spirit, 287; on creation, 287; the Primacy, 327; Mary's sanctity and immaculate conception, 443; suffrages for the dead, 453, 454.
Epiclesis: its relation to Eucharistic conversion, 354, 472.
Epiphanius of Salamis: life and writings, 230; his teaching on the Trinity, 266, 267; on the procession of the Holy Spirit, 491; the angels, 297; origin of the soul, 300; the Church, 326, 327; superiority of bishops over priests, 326; Mary's virginity, 442; purgatory, 454; resurrection of the dead, 458; veneration of the saints, 450.
Eschatology: in the Old Testament, 25, 26, 27; the Synoptists, 38, 39; St. John, 41; St. Paul, 43; the Apostolic Fathers, 96, 97; the Apologists, 133; Irenæus, 148; Hippolytus, 152; Tertullian, 169; Clement of Alexandria, 197; Origen, 202; 4th cent. writers, 457–463.
Essenes: Jewish ascetics, 21.
Eucharist: in the Synoptists, 38; St. John, 40; St. Paul, 42; the Apostolic Fathers, 91–93; Justin Martyr, 131, 132; Irenæus, 146, 147; Tertullian, 167, 168; Cyprian, 178, 179; Clement of Alexandria, 196, 197; Origen, 207; 4th cent. writers, 352, 353; later writers, 472, 473. Cfr. Conversion, Epiclesis.
Eunomius: Arian leader, 244; his teaching on the nature of God, 255.
Eusebius of Cæsarea: life and writings, 228; the part he played at the Council of Nicaea, 226; in the Arian reaction, 239; his remarks on the paschal dispute, 139; on St. Peter in Rome, 329.
Eusebius of Dorylæum: charges Eutyches with heretical teaching, 401; is violently attacked at the Robber Synod, 402.
Eusebius of Nicomedia: his relations with Constantine, 237; head of the Eusebians, 237; temporary success of his party, 243.
Eutyches: author of the Monophysite heresy, 401, 402; condemned by Flavian, 402; appeals to the Pope, 402; supported by the Robber Synod, 404; condemned by the Council of Chalcedon, 406.
Evil, origin of: Gnostic views,

101–104; Christian solution, 145, 282; teaching of Augustine, 283, 284.
Extreme Unction: in Apostolic times, 52; Tertullian, 168; 4th cent. writers, 355; later writers, 474.

Fathers, Apostolic: their writings, 62–69; their teaching, 69–98; on God, 70, 72; the divinity of Christ, 72–75; the Holy Ghost, 75, 76; the Trinity, 75, 76; creation, 70; the humanity of Christ, 76–78; the hypostatic union, 68; the redemption, 78–80; the Church, 80–89; baptism, 90–93; penance, 93–96; matrimony, 96; eschatology, 96; their conservatism, 97, 98; the Eucharist, 91–93.
Faith: definition of, 48, 49; its necessity for salvation, 49, 53, 69, 70, 71: it must bear fruit in good works, 97, 113, 114, 145, 166; its relation to knowledge, 192–194.
Faustus of Riez: opposes predestinarianism, 384; his relation to Semi-Pelagianism, 384; his teaching is attacked by the Scythian monks and Fulgentius of Ruspe, 384, 385.
Felix III, Pope: appealed to by Talaias of Antioch, 412; excommunicates Acacius of Constantinople, 413.
Felix IV, Pope: his propositions against the Semi-Pelagians, 385.
Felix of Urgel: defends Adoptionism, 498; is condemned by several synods, 500.
Filioque controversy: its origin in the West, 495; historical aspect of the doctrine involved, 490–495; the position taken by the East, 496, 497.
Flavian of Constantinople: excommunicates Eutyches, 402; is deposed by the Robber Synod, 404; sent into exile, 404.
Frankfort, synod of: on the veneration of images, 488; condemns Spanish Adoptionism, 501.
Free Will: man's natural endowment, 23; not lost in the fall, 301; but inclined to evil, 302; necessary for the practice of virtue, 127, 128; 145, 166; unduly emphasized by Pelagius, 368; and Semi-Pelagians, 380; its action under the influence of grace, 370–372; 376.
Fulgentius of Ruspe: opposes Faustus of Riez on the question of grace and predestination, 384, 385.

Germanus of Constantinople: bears witness to the Assumption, 448.
Gnosticism: in Apostolic times, 56, 57; fundamental concepts of, 101, 102; various systems, 102; common elements, 103, 104; its influence on Christian thought, 104, 105.
God, His nature and attributes: in the Old Testament, 21, 22; Philo, 31; the Apostolic Fathers, 70–73; in Gnostic writings, 103; the Apologists, 116, 118, 125; Irenæus, 145; Hippolytus, 149, 150; Tertullian, 162; Novatian, 170; Clement of Alexandria, 194, 195; Origen, 201; Arius, 254; Eunomius, 255; 4th cent. writers, Greek, 255–258; Latin, 258–260; Augustine, 258, 259.
Gregory the Great, Pope: his teaching on the orders and choirs of angels, 296; on the Primacy, 470; purgatory, 456; grace, 466.
Gregory III, Pope: condemns the Iconoclasts, 482.
Gregory of Nazianzus: life and writings, 229; his teaching on the essence and attributes of God, 256; on the Trinity, 264; creation, 282, 287; the angels, 294, 297; Adam's primitive condition, 304; Christology, 308–312; the redemption, 319, 320; original sin, 361; the necessity of

grace, 370, 371; divorce, 355; Mary's virginity, 442; the beatific vision, 460; his exposition of the Macedonian heresy, 249.
Gregory of Nyssa: life and writings, 230; his teaching on God, 356, 357; the Trinity, 264; procession of the Holy Spirit, 265, 491; the angels, 294, 295, 299; origin of the human soul, 300; Adam's primitive condition, 304; sacramental character, 342; the redemption, 320; Eucharistic conversion, 358; original sin, 361; purgatory, 453; resurrection of the body, 459; apokatastasis, 460; veneration of the saints, 450.

Hadrian I, Pope: opposes Spanish Adoptionism, 499; approves the Synod of Frankfort, 501.
Hadrian II, Pope: condemns Photius, 502; sends legates to the 8th General Council, 502.
Harnack: his views on the corrupting influence of paganism on the message of Christ, 15, 16; on the early Christian concept of God, 71; the divinity of Christ, 74; the Cappadocians as "homoiousians," 267; the difference of the Trinitarian teaching of the East and West, 268; on Pope Celestine's treatment of Nestorius, 395.
Hegesippus: fragment of his writtings on the Church and Apostolic succession, 135.
Hell: eternity of, 460–462.
Helvidius: denies the virginity of Mary, 444: refuted by St. Jerome, 444, 445.
Henoticon of Zeno, the: its origin and purpose, 412.
Heresy: in Apostolic times, 57–61; Docetic, 77; Gnostic, 101–105; Monarchian, 153–156; Arian, 219–225; Semi-Arian, 241–244; Macedonian, 248–249; Apollinarian, 249–251; Manichæan, 276–279; Priscillian, 279–282; Pelagian, 357–360; Semi-Pelagian, 379–386; Nestorian, 387–396; Monophysite, 401–404; Monothelite, 423–428; Iconoclast, 481–485; Adoptionist, 498–501.
Hermas: brother of Pope Pius I, 67; contents of the "Shepherd," 67, 68; his teaching on God, 70; the divinity of Christ, 75; the Holy Ghost, 75, 76; the redemption, 79; the Church, 85–87; baptism, 90, 91; penance, 93–95; matrimony, 96; the hierarchy, 86, 87; Primacy, 87.
Hierarchy: teaching of St. Paul, 42; the Acts, 52; the Apostolic Fathers, 82, 83, 87, 88, 89; Tertullian, 167, 169; Cyprian, 172; Clement of Alexandria, 196; Origen, 205; 4th cent. writers, 326–328; later writers, 474.
Hilary of Poitiers: life and writings, 233; his teaching on God, 258; the Trinity, 268, 269; procession of the Holy Spirit, 494; the angels, 295; the divinity of Christ, 313; His human perfections, 314; creation, 286, 287; the redemption, 321; original sin, 361; the necessity of grace, 372; the judgment, 457; resurrection of the dead, 459.
Hippolytus: his writings, 149; his teaching on God, 149, 150; the Logos, 150; divine sonship, 150; the Holy Ghost, 150, 151; the God-Man, 150; the redemption, 151; the Church, 151; baptism, 151; penance, 151; eschatology, 151, 152.
Holy Ghost, the: teaching of the Synoptists, 44; St. John, 44; St. Paul, 45; the Apostolic Fathers, 75, 76; the Apologists, 125, 126; Irenaeus, 146; Hippolytus, 150; Tertullian, 162–165; Novatian, 170; Clement of Alexandria, 195; Origen, 200, 201, 204; Gregory Thaumaturgus, 212; the Council of Nicæa, 226; the Macedonian heretics, 249; the 1st Council of Constantinople, 252; 4th cent.

writers, Greek, 262–268; Latin, 268–271; Augustine, 271–275. Procession of, cfr. "Filioque clause."
Homoousios: use of the term by Paul of Samosata, 155; Tertullian, 162; Clement of Alexandria, 194; Origen, 201, 204; Dionysius of Alexandria, 212; the Council of Nicæa, 226, 227; during the Arian reaction, 238 foll.; 4th cent. writers, Greek, 263, 266, 268; Latin, 270.
Honorius, Pope: his first and second letter to Sergius, 424, 425; interpretation of them by John IV and Abbot Maximus, 431; view taken by the 6th General Council, 430; by Leo II, 430.
Hormisdas, Pope: refuses to approve the addition to the Trisagion, 414; his formula subscribed by the Eastern bishops, 413; by the 8th General Council, 503.
Hosius of Cordova: his life and activity, 233; ecclesiastical adviser of Constantine, 223; at the Council of Nicæa, 227; presides over the Council of Sardica, 242; his fall, 245.
Hypostasis: use of the term during the Arian reaction, 238; by the Cappadocians, 264–268; Cyril of Alexandria, 409; the Antiochene school, 409, 410; Theodoret of Cyrus, 436, 437; Leontius of Byzantium, 438; its Latin equivalent, 435.
Hypostatic Union: see "Christ, unity of person."

Iconoclast Heresy: in Syria, 481; in the Eastern Empire, 482, 485; condemned by the 2nd Council of Nicæa, 486; opposition to image-veneration in the West, 487, 488.
Ignatius of Antioch: his letters and their contents, 65, 66; his teaching on the sources of faith, 69; on God, 70; the divinity of the Logos, 74; the Holy Ghost, 76; the Trinity, 76; the unity of person and duality of nature in Christ, 77, 78; the redemption, 79; the Church, 83, 84; the hierarchy, 84; the Primacy, 84, 85; the Eucharist, 92, 93; penance, 92, matrimony, 96.
Ignatius of Constantinople: his deposition and banishment, 501; reinstated, 502; appeals to the Pope for a general council, 502.
Images, veneration of: meaning and purpose of the cult, 476; historical aspect, 477–481; condemned by the synod of Constantinople, 484, 485; approved by the 2nd Council of Nicæa, 486; approval reaffirmed by the 8th General Council, 503; controversy in the West, 487, 488.
Innocent I, Pope: approves the Council of Carthage against the Pelagians, 358; his teaching on extreme unction, 355.
Irenæus of Lyons: life and writtings, 138–140; his position as a theologian, 140, 141; 159; his teaching on God, 145; the divinity of Christ, 146; the Holy Ghost, 146; the Trinity, 146; original sin, 145; on grace, 304; Holy Scripture, 141; the Rule of Faith, 141, 142; the Church, 142–145; the Primacy, 144; baptism of children, 146; the Eucharist, 146, 147; sacrifice, 147; penance, 148, 185, 188; the Millennium, 148; on the Virgin Mary, 146.
Isidore of Pelusium: his teaching on original sin, 467.
Isidore of Seville: his teaching on grace, 466; the origin of the soul, 466; the sacraments, 471.
Israel: its relation to Christianity, 18–34.

Jerome of Stridon: life and writings, 234; his teaching on the Trinity, 270; the angels, 295, 298; origin of the soul, 301; holy orders, 355; Mary's virginity, 444;

eternity of hell, 460; his estimate of St. Cyprian, 172; original sin, 361, 362; veneration of the saints, 450.
Jews, the: of Palestine, 18–30; of the Dispersion, 30–34; as converts, 52, 53, 55, 56.
John of Antioch: counsels Nestorius to submit to the Pope, 393; his controversy with Cyril, 396; opposes the Council of Ephesus, 398, 399; his submission, 399.
John IV, Pope: condemns the Monothelites, 426, 427; his interpretation of the letters of Honorius, 431.
Jovinian: denies the virginity of Mary, 444; is refuted by St. Jerome, 444, 445.
Judgment, the: teaching of the Old Testament, 26, 27; the Synoptists, 38; St. John, 41; St. Paul, 43; the Apostolic Fathers, 96; the Apologists, 133; Irenæus, 148; Hippolytus, 152; 4th cent. writers, 457, 458.
Julian the Apostate; bears witness to the veneration of images, 479.
Julian of Eclanum: denies original sin, 357, 358.
Julius I, Pope: convenes a synod at Rome and reinstates Athanasius, 241; reproves the Eusebians, 241; his vindication of the Primacy, 328.
Justin Martyr: writings of, 111; his views on philosophy, 115; his teaching on God, 118; the Logos, 118–120; the Trinity, 126; on man, 128; the immortality of the soul, 128, 129; original sin, 129; the Church, 129–132; baptism, 130, 131; the Eucharist, 131, 132; the virginity of Mary, 133; the Millennium, 133.
Justinian, Emperor: condemns Origen, 415; supports the Scythian monks, 415; his treatment of Pope Vigilius, 417–419; condemns the Three Chapters, 416.

Lateran Council: convened by Martin I, 427; rejects the Ecthesis and the Typus, and condemns the Monothelite heresy, 427, 428.
Leo I, Pope: his Epistola Dogmatica, 402, 403; his letter to the Council of Chalcedon, 405; confirms the Council, but not the 28th canon, 407; his teaching on the redemption, 468; Christology, 434; the Primacy, 470.
Leo II, Pope: confirms the 6th General Council, 430.
Leo III, Pope: approves the doctrine of the Filioque but refuses its insertion in the Creed, 497; confirms the Synod of Frankfort, 501.
Leontius of Byzantium: life and writings, 437; his Christology, 437–439; his relation to Scholasticism, 439.
Leontius of Neapolis: his teaching on the veneration of images, 480.
Liberius, Pope: his reputed fall, 245.
Logos, doctrine of: in the writings of Philo, 31, 32; St. John, 32; Ignatius of Antioch, 74; the Apologists, 118–125; Hippolytus, 150; Novatian, 170; Clement of Alexandria, 192, 194; Origen, 200, 201, 203; Arius, 222; Alexander of Alexandria, 122, 123; Tertullian, 165. Cfr. "Christology."
Lucian of Antioch: teacher of Arius, 220; condemned on account of his Christological errors, 220.

Macedonian Heresy: its rise and spread, 248, 249; condemned by the 2nd General Council, 251.
Macarius of Antioch: defends the Monothelite heresy, 429; is excommunicated, 430.
Leo the Isaurian: proscribes image-veneration, 482.
Manichæism: its origin, 276, 277; fundamental doctrines, 277; refuted by Augustine, 277–279.

Marcellus of Ancyra: accused of Sabellianism, 237; deposed by the Eusebians, 237; reinstated by the Pope, 241; at Sardica, 242; condemned by the 2nd General Council, 251.
Marcion, Gnostic heretic: his teaching, 102, 103; admitted to penance, 103.
Mariology: in the early centuries, 133, 146, 216, 442; after the Council of Ephesus, 446; Mary's divine motherhood, 74, 150, 166, 311, 390, 391, 398, 411, 442; her perpetual virginity, 442–445; immaculate conception, 443, 445–447; eminent sanctity, 446, 447; feasts in her honor, 447, 448; the Assumption, 447, 448, note.
Martin I, Pope: convenes the Lateran Council and condemns the Monothelite heresy, 427, 428; his teaching on the procession of the Holy Spirit, 493.
Matrimony: teaching of the Old Testament, 25; St. Paul, 43; the Apostolic Fathers, 96; Tertullian, 164; Cyprian, 179; Clement of Alexandria, 197; Origen, 207; 4th cent. writers, 355; Augustine, 347; later writers, 475. Impediments of, 355, 475; indissolubility, 44, 96, 197, 207, 179, 355, 475; cfr. "Divorce."
Martyrdom: baptism of blood, see "Baptism."
Martyrium Polycarpi: contents of, 67; its teaching on the divinity of Christ, 73; on the veneration of saints, 450.
Maximus Confessor: his part in the Monothelite controversy, 423, 427; is tortured and banished, 428; his Christology, 439–441; his teaching on the procession of the Holy Spirit, 493; on the veneration of images, 480.
Maximus of Turin: his teaching on the veneration of saints, 451.
Meletius of Antioch: deposed by the Council of Nicæa, 227; his connection with the Semi-Arians, 236, 239; presides at the 2nd General Council, 248.
Melito of Sardis: writings of, 111; his teaching on the divinity of Christ, 121; on the unity of person in Christ, 127.
Messias: in the Prophetical Books, 27, 28; in Jewish expectations, 28, 29; in apocryphal writings, 29; Philo, 32; the Synoptists, 45, 46; St. Paul, 47; as preached in the early Church, 51, 53.
Methodius of Olympus: his teaching on original sin, 213, 360; on the Church, 214.
Millennium, the: doctrine of, 105–107; origin of the doctrine, 105; defended by Pseudo-Barnabas, 97, 107; Papias, 106, 107; Justin Martyr, 107; Irenæus, 107; Tertullian, 107.
Minucius, Felix: writings of, 112; opposes the veneration of images, 478.
Monarchianism: origin of the heresy, 153, 154; different systems, 154; Dynamic, 154; Modalistic, 155, 156.
Monophysite Heresy: its origin, 401, 402; condemned at Chalcedon, 406; later Monophysites, 408.
Monothelite Heresy: its origin, 423–428; condemned by the 6th General Council, 430; conduct of Pope Honorius, 424, 425.
Montanism: rise and spread of, 156–158.
Mother of God, the: see "Mariology."
Muratorian Canon: a list of New Testament writings, 136, 137.

Nicæa: 1st Council of, 223–228; condemns the teaching of Arius and defines the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father, 225–227; Creed of, 226; canons, 228; adjusts the paschal dispute, 227; deposes Meletius, 227.—2nd Council of; condemns the Icono-

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

clasts and approves the veneration of images, 486, 487.
Nicetas of Remesiana: writings of, 235; his teaching on the Trinity, 270.
Noetus: Monarchian heretic, 154, 156.
Novatian: life and writings, 169, 170; his teaching on the divinity of the Word, 170; on the Holy Ghost, 170, 171; divine sonship, 171; Christology, 171.

Optatus of Mileve: life and writings, 235; his teaching on the notes of the Church, 329–331; the Primacy, 331; the sacraments, 346.
Orders, Holy: in the Epistles of St. Paul, 42; the Acts, 52; the Didache, 87; Clement of Rome, 81; Tertullian, 168; 4th cent. writers, 355, 326; Augustine, 347, 350; later writers, 474; character, 342, 350.
Origen: life and writings, 197, 199; contents of the *Peri Archon*, 198–203; his teaching on God, 201; the Logos, 201; the Holy Spirit, 201; the Trinity, 201, 203; Holy Scripture, 202, 203; creation, 202, 203; preëxistence of souls, 202; the angels, 202, 299; Christology, 204; the redemption, 204, 205; the Church, 205; penance, 205–207, 185; the Eucharist, 207; matrimony, 207, 208; baptism of children, 205; original sin, 208, 360; purgatory, 452; apokatastasis, 202; later controversy on his writings, 415; condemnation by the 5th General Council, 415.

Pacian of Barcelona: his three letters, 235; his teaching on original sin, 362.
Paganism: corrupting influence of, 14–17; opposition to Christianity, 107–109.
Papias of Hierapolis: some fragments of his writings, 66; his teaching on the Millennium, 106.
Patripassianism: see "Monarchianism."
Paul of Samosata: his Adoptionist teaching, 155.
Paulinus of Aquileia: his teaching on the procession of the Holy Spirit, 496; opposes Spanish Adoptionism, 499.
Pelagius: his denial of original sin, 357–360; his teaching on grace, 358; 359; 368, 369.
Pelagius II, Pope: confirms the 5th General Council, 419.
Penance: in the early Church, 183–189. Cfr. "Sin, forgiveness of."
Peter of Alexandria: his opposition to Origen, 213; his teaching on the Incarnation, 213.
Pharisees: a Jewish party, its origin and object, 20.
Philo Judæus: his teaching on God, 31; the Logos, 31, 32; creation, 31, 32; angelology, 32; anthropology, 32, 33.
Philosophy: of the Romans, 10, 11; the Greeks, 12; Philo, 31; pagan philosophy as viewed by the Apologists, 114, 115; by Clement of Alexandria, 191.
Phœbadius of Agen: writings of, 235; his teaching on the Trinity, 270; the divinity of Christ, 313.
Photius: made patriarch of Constantinople, 502; his schism, 502; deposed by the Emperor and condemned by the 8th General Council, 503.
Φύσις: use of the term by Basil, 263; Amphilochius, 266; Cyril of Alexandria, 409; the Antiochene school, 409.
Polycarp of Smyrna: his letter to the Philippians, 66, 67; his teaching on the divinity of Christ, 73; the Trinity, 76; the hierarchy, 88; on penance, 93.
Prayers for the dead: see "Purgatory, suffrages."
Praxeas: Monarchian heretic, 156.
Predestination: teaching of Augustine, 378; of the Semi-Pelagians, 281; of Lucidus, 384; Faustus of

Riez, 384; Prosper, 382, "De Vocatione Gentium," 383.
Primacy, the: teaching of the Synoptists, 37; St. John, 40; Ignatius, 87; Clement of Rome, 82, 83; Hermas, 87; Origen, 205; Cyprian, 174–177; Irenæus, 143, 144; Tertullian, 167; Clement of Alexandria, 196; 4th cent. writers, 330, 331, 327, 328; Augustine, 335, 336; later writers, 470.
Priscillianism: its origin and spread, 279, 280; its doctrines, 280–282.
Prosper of Aquitaine: opposes the views of Cassian, 381, 382; his teaching on grace, predestination, reprobation, 382; appeals to the Pope, 382, 383.
Pseudo-Areopagite, the: his teaching on God, 260; the angels, 295, 296; the Assumption, 448.
Pseudo-Barnabas: contents of the letter, 64; its teaching on the divinity of Christ, 73, 74; unity of person in Christ, 77, 78; the redemption, 78, 79; the Church, 88; confession, 184; the Millennium, 97.
Purgatory: doctrine of, 452; sufferings in, 453, 455; suffrages for the dead, 453–456.

Real Presence, the: as taught by Ignatius, 92; Justin Martyr, 132; Irenæus, 147; Tertullian, 167, 168; Cyprian, 178; Clement of Alexandria, 196; Origen, 207; 4th cent. writers, 352, 353; later writers, 472.
Redemption, doctrine of: in St. Paul, 48, 49; the Apostolic Fathers, 77–80; the Apologists, 127; Irenæus, 146; Hippolytus, 151; Tertullian, 166; Clement of Alexandria, 196; Origen, 204, 205; 4th cent. writers, Greek, 317–320; Latin, 320, 321; Augustine, 321, 322; later writers, 468.
Religion: among the Romans, 8, 9, 14; the Greeks, 11, 12, 13; Oriental nations, 13.
Rusticus, deacon: his teaching on the veneration of images, 479, 480.

Sabbath: observance of among the Jews, 25; among the early Christians, 55, 56.
Sabellius: Monarchian heretic, 156.
Sacraments: symbolism of, 338–341, 343, 344; character, 341, 344, 350; efficacy does not depend on the moral disposition of the minister, 342–348, 349; disposition of the recipient, 349; institution by Christ, 348, definition of, 347, 348; number, 350, 351, 471.
Sacrifice: among the Romans, 8; the Greeks, 11; Oriental nations, 13; in the Old Testament, 24, 25, 28; the Synoptists, 38; St. John, 40; St. Paul, 42; the Apostolic Fathers, 91, 92; the Apologists, 132; Irenæus, 147; Tertullian, 168; Cyprian, 178; Origen, 207; 4th cent. writers, 354, 355; later writers, 472.
Sadducees: a Jewish sect, 20.
Saints: veneration of, 449–452; Communion of, 463.
Satisfaction: see "Redemption."
Schism: Novatian, 169; Donatist, 323–325; Acacian, 413; Photian, 502; teaching on, the Apostolic Fathers, 97, 98; Justin Martyr, 130; Irenæus, 143–145; Clement of Alexandria, 196; Adamantius, 214; Cyprian, 173, 174; 4th cent. writers, 325, 326; Augustine, 332, 333.
Scythian Monks: their defense of the formula, "unus ex Trinitate crucifixus est," 414; oppose Faustus of Riez, 384.
Secunda Clementis: origin and contents, 68, 69; its teaching on the divinity of Christ, 74, 75; the Church, 88, 89; the seal of baptism, 91; confession of sins, 93, 184.
Semi-Arians: opposed to the Council of Nicæa, 241–244; deny the divinity of the Holy Ghost, 244;

condemned by the 2nd General Council, 251.
Semi-Pelagians: attribute the beginning of good works to man's natural powers, 379–386; condemned by the 2nd Council of Orange, 385.
Serapion of Thmuis: his teaching on confirmation, 342; extreme unction, 355.
Sergius of Constantinople: his heretical views, 423, 431; the Ecthesis, 424, 426; his letters to Pope Honorius, 424; condemned by the 6th General Council, 430.
Simon Magus: teaching of, 102.
Sin, Original: teaching of the Old Testament, 24; the Apocryphas, 24; Philo, 33; St. Paul, 48, 49; the Apologists, 129; Irenæus, 145; Clement of Alexandria, 195; Origen, 360; Methodius, 360, 213; Cyprian, 361; 4th cent. writers, Greek, 360, 361; Latin, 361, 362; Augustine, 362–367; later writers, 467, 468.
Sin, Personal, forgiveness of: in the Old Testament, 24; St. John, 40; the Apostolic Fathers, 93–96, 184; Dionysius of Corinth, 184; Irenæus, 148, 188; Clement of Alexandria, 197; Origen, 205–207, 185; Tertullian, 186, 188; Hippolytus, 151, 187; Cyprian, 179; Pope Callistus, 187; 4th cent. writers, 351, 352; Augustine, 351, note; later writers, 473.
Social Conditions: among the Romans, 6, 7; the Greeks, 7; the Jews, 19–21, 25; of first converts, 56, 57.
Sophronius of Jerusalem: his part in the Monothelite controversy, 423, 424; his synodal letter, 424.
Stephen, Pope: defends the validity of heretical baptism, 180–182.
Sylvester, Pope: sends legates to the 1st Council of Nicæa, 224.

Tarasius of Constantinople: his teaching on the veneration of images, 486; petitions the Pope for a general council, 486.
Tatian: writings of, 111; his teaching on the Logos, 121, 123, 124; on original sin, 129.
Theodore, Pope: condemns the Ecthesis and deposes Paul of Constantinople, 427.
Theodore of Canterbury: his teaching on reordination, 474; on divorce, 475; the Filioque, 496.
Theodore of Mopsuestia: life and writings, 232; opposes Eucharistic symbolism, 340; his teaching on the person of Christ, 388, 389; the Mother of God, 389; procession of the Holy Spirit, 493.
Theodoret of Cyrus: attacks Cyril's anathematisms, 396; condemned by the 5th General Council, 419; his Christology, 435–437; his teaching on the veneration of images, 479; on the procession of the Holy Spirit, 492.
Theodotus: Monarchian heretic, 154; excommunicated by Pope Victor, 154.
Theognastus: his teaching on the divinity of Christ, 212.
Theology: beginnings of, in the West, 159; in the East, 190.
Toledo, council of: inserts the Filioque clause in the Creed, 495.
Theotokos: see, "Mother of God," under "Mariology."
Traducianism: teaching of Tertullian, 301; 4th cent. writers, 300, 301; later writers, 465, 466.
Transubstantiation: see, "Eucharistic conversion," under "Eucharist."
Trinity, the: teaching of the Old Testament, 22; the Synoptists, 44; St. John, 44; St. Paul, 44, 45; the Apostolic Fathers, 75, 76; the Apologists, 126, 127; Irenæus, 146; Monarchian heretics, 156; Tertullian, 162–165; Novatian, 170; Clement of Alexandria, 195; Origen, 201, 203; Dionysius of Corinth, 212; Gregory Thaumaturgus, 212, 213; Adamantius,

214; 1st Council of Nicæa, 226; the 2nd General Council, 252; 4th cent. writers, Greek, 261–268; Latin, 269–275; Augustine, 270–274; the Quicumque, 274, 275.
Trisagion: added to by Peter the Fuller, 414.
Typus, the: edict of Constans II during the Monothelite controversy, 427; condemned by Martin I, 428.

Victorinus, Marius: his writings, 235; his teaching on the necessity of grace, 372; trichotomy, 300; preëxistence of souls, 300; procession of the Holy Spirit, 495.
Vigilius, Pope: opposes the condemnation of the Three Chapters, 416; his Judicatum and Constitutum, 417, 418; refuses to appear at the Council, 418; approves the Council, 419; the bearing of his decisions on Papal Infallibility, 420–421.
Victor I, Pope: the paschal controversy, 139, 140; excommunicates Theodotus, 154.
Vincent of Lerins: defends Semi-Pelagian views, 382.

Worship: among the Romans, 8; the Greeks, 11; Oriental nations, 13; the first Christians, 54–56, 57; during the 2nd century, 131, 132.

Zeno of Verona: his teaching on the Trinity, 270; the Incarnation, 313; on Mary's virginity, 444; eternity of hell, 461.
Zozimus, Pope: condemns the Pelagian heresy, 358.

Dat

636 234.233.3
Otten, Bernard 077
63 AUTHOR
Manual of the History of
TITLE
vol. 1
GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION LIBRARY
BERKELEY, CA 94709